



# INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, September 10, 2020 | 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM | Zoom Meeting

## Meeting Minutes

### 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

- ❖ Implement the integration of all ACCJC standards throughout campus structure and processes.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Coordinate resources and provide professional development for effective online instruction and remote delivery of student support services and college processes to advance equitable student outcomes.

### Committee Name      Quorum

#### Members Present:

##### Faculty

Meghan Swanson-Garoupa, A&H  
TBD, BSSL  
Jason Craighead, PATH  
Jill Carbone, STEM  
TBD, Student Services  
Angella VenJohn

##### Classified Professionals

David Rodriguez  
Frances DeNisco  
Heidi Ulrech

##### Students

TBA (2)

##### Administrators

Rajinder Samra, Director of Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (Chair)  
William Garcia, V.P. of Student Services  
Kristina Whalen, V.P. of Academic Services  
Anette Raichbart, V.P. of Administrative Services

#### Members Absent:

#### 1. Call to Order

R.Samra called the meeting to order at 2:33 PM. Quorum was met.

#### 2. Review and Approval of Agenda

J.Carbone / 2<sup>nd</sup> - W.Garcia - Unanimous

#### 3. Review and Approval of Minutes

None presented

#### 4. Agenda Items

##### 1. Review of IPEC's Charge and Membership:

Committee reviewed charge for members and duties. It is noted that a member from BSSL is needed.

##### 2. Discussion of College Planning Priorities:

R. Samra reviewed the 4 standing planning priorities. He notes that the first planning priority has been on the list longest, as it takes a lot of work to integrate the standards into college processes. Second planning priority is reviewed and it's mentioned that it predates the college mission. The third priority is reviewed as well as its importance. The last planning priority is reviewed by President Foster. He highlights the work and efforts of the IPEC committee and thanks them for their coordination and work during this time. He notes the importance of the planning priority during the pandemic to ensure equity and success for the students.

R. Samra mentions that he will be inviting VP's to the October meeting to give the committee an idea of the progress on these planning priorities, so that expectations can be set for this committee. In the spring, the VPs will be invited back again to review the planning priorities.

##### 3. Review of Planning Budget Cycle

R. Samra begins by giving an overview of the Planning and Budget Cycle. This process is driven by College Mission Goals and Priorities. It begins with Program Review Process (PR Summaries) › College Planning Priorities › Resource Allocation Process (Resource Prioritization Informs Tentative Budget) › Budget Development Process. The role of IPEC is to assess the effectiveness of the processes, and the role of College Council is to assess the degree of integration of the planning budget and allocations.

##### 4. Evaluation of the Program Review Process

# INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

## COMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, September 10, 2020 | 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM | Zoom

A survey was sent out in spring 2020. There were 59 participants, 51 of whom were faculty. One of the questions that is brought up frequently is the need to review every year. It is not required every year by accreditation. The feedback from the committee was that there were updates every other year and a major review every 3 years. There was a suggestion that maybe this data can be used in other areas of the college. N. Taylor mentions that program review is not used as a sole venue to request things for programs. H. Ulrech suggest that the administrative areas also need to be included in this review. It is understood that the instructional areas are the ones being considered, but there also needs to be an evaluation of the operation areas of the college. N. Taylor mentions student services and how they touch on this in various ways, but it may not show up in program review. R. Samra will bring up to Administrators during the Administrators meeting.

### 5. Potential Update to College Values Statement

The proposed college statement is reviewed and presented to new IPEC members for review: Las Positas College thrives as a collaborative teaching and learning community committed to integrity and excellence by 1. Encouraging and celebrating lifelong learning 2. Responding to the needs of the ever-changing workplace and society 3. Demonstrating civic, social, and environmental responsibility 4. Promoting ethical behaviors, mutual trust equity, and respect within our diverse community 5. Fostering a climate of discovery, creativity, personal development, and physical and mental health 6. Ensuring that Las Positas is a sanctuary camps for undocumented students 7. Holding firm to the belief that each of us makes an astonishing difference 8 – *(New Draft Item)* Committing to anti-racist policies and practices. This value statement was reviewed and approved by Classified Senate. There was no negative feedback, only positive from IPEC Committee.

### 6. Metrics Goals for the Educational Master Plan

R. Samra requests feedback on student success and student outcomes presentation.

### 7. Student Success and Other Outcome Data

Data is shared with committee. Fall 16 was 53%, Fall 17 was 54%, Fall 18 52% and Fall 19 was 49% not a good trend. R. Samra asks if presentation clear. A. VenJohn is requesting a copy of the presentation for usage of guided pathways. She also mentioned that Modesto Jr. College has success teams that were not enrolled for fall they reached out to their students and they had 2,000 enrollments. R. Samra said he went through the enrollment process and had to wait weeks to enroll. This could be a reason why students are being lost.

Access rates are at 60% for multi ethnic, 52% for Latinx, 51% for White, 50% Filipino, 50% for Asian, 45% for African American. There is discussion about this being helpful for Guided Pathways and ConnectUp, as this may help in closing this gap. F. DeNisco mentions that we should include data coaching support when presenting this information.

The success report and equity report are pretty similar. Fall-to-fall retention is also very similar to the other two reports. There was discussion regarding associate degrees awarded; it was the highest since 2010-11 at 927 compared to 817 in 2018-19 and 814 to 2017-18. It may be that some capstone course instructors are aware of the deadlines and encourage students to apply for graduation. This is not common at sister college. Transfer degrees could pass associate degrees by 2021.

Certificates have been cyclical going up and down by AY. This may be due to capstone courses, but in AY 2019-20 it went up to 536 vs. 222 for AY 2018-19 and 171 for AY 2017-18. The committee discussed how this affected funding and how these numbers are being inflated by the auto awarding of the certificates.

# INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MINUTES

---

*Thursday, September 10, 2020 | 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM | Zoom*

R. Samra asks about setting goals for persistence, similar to those on the number of degrees awarded and the number of certificates, in the educational master plan? We did not set metric goals last year. Would it actually be meaningful to set these goals? N. Taylor asks if there is a negatives to setup goals/metrics. F.DeNisco has concerns for the inclusion of these if they may not really be used by the program review and may not be useful. A. VenJohn proposed the committee table this discussion and have the members go back to its constituent groups to have a conversation about pros and cons with adding metrics to the Educational Master Plan. R. Samra also mentioned that these metrics can be added to another document.

## **8. Adjournment 4:37 PM**

## **9. Next Regular Meeting: October 8, 2020**