LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning.

LPC Planning Priorities

❖ Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities.

❖ Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus.

Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee   Quorum = 7

Members Present:

Faculty
Meghan Swanson-Garoupa, A&H
Nadiyah Taylor, BSSL
Paul Sapsford, PATH
Jill Carbone, STEM
Vacant, Student Services

Classified Professionals
Danielle Banuelos
Frances DeNisco
Amanda Ingold
Heidi Ulrech
Aubrie Ross

Students
Vacant (2)

Administrators
Rajinder Samra, Director of Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (Chair)
Jeanne Wilson, V.P. of Student Services
Anette Raichbart, V.P. of Administrative Services

Members Absent:
Kristina Whalen, V.P. of Academic Services

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE DRAFT MINTUES

Thursday, September 09, 2021| 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM |Zoom Meeting

Meeting Minutes

1. **Call to Order**
   R. Samra called the meeting to order at 2:33 PM. All members introduced themselves, including their names and the offices in which they work. Quorum was met.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda:**
   Motion was made to approve the agenda - J.Carbone / N.Taylor 2nd – Unanimous Approval.

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes:**
   Motion was made to approve minutes for 12.10.20, 02.11.21, 03.11.21, 03.29.21, and 05.13.21 – Motion - F.DeNisco / 2nd J. Carbone - Abstentions: A.Ross, J.Wilson, D. Banuelos. No nays. Motion was approved.

4. **Review of Committee Charge:**
   R. Samra reviewed the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee's charge (see Attachment A). He discussed key functions of the committee and its oversight. Moreover, he discussed in detail the types of information that IPEC reviews in order to arrive at College Planning Priorities.

5. **Review and Evaluation of College Planning and Budget Cycle:**
   R.Samra reviewed the College's Integrated Planning and Budget Cycle flowchart (see Attachment B). The cycle contains the following four processes:

   - Program Review Process
   - College Planning Process
   - Budget Development Process
   - Resource Allocation Process

   R. Samra reviewed each of the processes, including the description, outcomes, and effectiveness of each process. He communicated the following about each process:

Program Review Process

The Program Review Process occurs in the fall. Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Unit program reviews are written. With regard to the Instructional and Student Services program reviews, they are summarized at the division level with the help of the Program Review Committee.

An evaluation of Program Review Process indicated that the process is effective in producing division program review summaries. There were, however, a few areas that were cited for improvement— reinforcing the purpose of program review and its linkage to the planning and budget process and highlighting the 2021-2026 Educational Master Plan as a college framework for program review.

College Planning Process

The College Planning Process occurs in the spring and IPEC plays a central role in the process. Division program review summaries are received by IPEC in order to help determine College Planning Priorities. In addition, IPEC reviews other information (e.g., strategic plans, institutional research, and accreditation requirements) in order to arrive at College Planning Priorities.

An evaluation of the College Planning Process indicated that the process is effective in producing College Planning Priorities. However, as with the Program Review Process, there are areas for improvement. These areas for improvement include reviewing the college's Economic and Workforce Development Plan, District-Wide Strategic Plan, institutional-level student learning outcomes, career and technical education data, AB-705 data, Board priorities, and the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER).

Budget Development Process

The Budget Development Process begins in January and concludes with the adoption of a budget in the fall. During this process, the budget is developed, reviewed, and approved. The outcomes of this process are budget and resource decisions are aligned with the College Planning Priorities; the Budget Development Committee helps play a role in the alignment.

This Budget Development Process was evaluated to be effective. Budget and resource decisions are aligned with College Planning Priorities. A table was created to show how each College Planning Priority in 2020-21 was linked with budget and resource decisions.

Resource Allocation Process

The College Planning and Budget flowchart shows that the Resource Allocation Process occurs in the fall. However, the Resource Allocation Process could also occur in the spring. Within the Resource Allocation Process, resources are prioritized and recommended by committees and approved by the College President. The result of the process is an allocation of resources that are aligned with College Planning Priorities.

An evaluation of Resource Allocation Process indicated that there is room for improvement. Committees play a central role in this process. A review of how committees utilize College Planning Priorities in their decision process revealed that a number of committees did not ask in their resource request form how the requests were linked with College Planning Priorities. On a positive note, it was discovered that an opportunity for alignment exists with the College President. For example, the President has communicated with the Resource

Allocation Committee regarding the decision to allocate resources in alignment with College Planning priorities.

Recommendation for Improvement of the Planning and Budget Flowchart

A suggestion was made by N. Taylor to improve the Planning and Budget flowchart in order to better capture the timing of the delivery of division summaries to IPEC. N. Taylor, who is the chair of the Program Review Committee, stated that Division program summaries would be delivered to IPEC in February instead of January and asked that the flowchart be updated to reflect this information. F. DeNisco recommended to extend the arrow to the February mark. R. Samra agreed to extending the arrow to February.

6. **Review of College Planning Priorities:**
R. Samra reviewed last year's four planning priorities and talked about the two that were graduated. He noted that there are two planning priorities this year. R. Samra shared an example of a College Planning Priority report (see Attachment C) that showed the solutions/steps to addressing the priority.

R. Samra asked the committee to consider if College Planning Priorities still need to be created in the context of a new Educational Master Plan (EMP) that has been well vetted. He noted that the concept of College Planning Priorities was initially created many years ago before there was an effective EMP and the interim College President wanted to determine key goals for the College. R. Samra recommended that IPEC consider whether or not we still need College Planning Priorities or focus on goals/strategies that have already been identified in the current EMP. This topic will be brought up at the next IPEC meeting.

7. **Status of Institution-Standards and Stretch Goals**
R. Samra reviewed the definition of Institutional-Set Standard and Stretch Goal before reviewing the status of the following four metrics: course completion rates, annual associated degrees awarded, annual certificates awarded, and annual transfers to the California State University and University of California systems (see Attachment D).

The definition of Institution-Set Standard is meeting or exceeding 95% of the five-year rolling average. The definition of Stretch Goal is meeting or exceeding 101% to 110% above the five-year rolling average; the exact percent above of the five-year rolling average depends on the metric. The following are the status of each metric with regard to meeting the institution-set standard and stretch goal:
   - Course Completion Rates. Both the institution-set standard and stretch goals were met for fall 2020.
   - Annual Associate Degrees Awarded. The College met the institution-set standard and nearly met the stretch goal for 2020-21.
   - Annual Certificates Awarded. The College met the institution-set standard and stretch goal for 2020-21 if non-credit certificates were included with credit certificates; however, institution-set standard and the stretch goal would not have been met if counting only credit certificates.
   - Annual Transfers. The College met the institution-set standard but not the stretch goal for 2019-20.

Motion: A motion was made to include both credit and non-credit certificates when determine whether the College meets the institution-set standard and stretch goal. *F.DeNisco / 2ⁿᵈ N.Taylor.* A brief discussion occurred as to why non-credit certificates should not be included; it was determined that there was no good reason not to include non-credit certificates. *The Motion Passed Unanimously.*

8. **Good of the Order**
J.Carbone noted that she will not be able to make October's IPEC meeting and asked if someone could share their notes so that she can share it at her division meeting. N. Taylor agreed to share her notes.

9. **Adjournment: Motion N.Taylor / J.Carbone 2nds - Unanimous**

   Next Meeting: October 14, 2021: 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM