CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE
Planning Committee
Minutes

Date: Jan. 05, 2021
Time: 12:30-2:30pm
Location: Zoom at [Zoom meeting link]
Link to: [CCC Committees Page]

Committee charge:

- Lead the creation and monitoring of the College Strategic Plan
- Monitor the implementation of campus-wide plans and initiatives as they relate to the College Strategic Plan
- Oversee the program review validation process
- Maintain and archive evidence that will support accreditation process and the continuous improvement of institutional effectiveness measures and processes
- Make recommendations to College Council and Budget Committee

2020 Committee Members & Structure:

Chairs: Dean of Institutional Effectiveness Mayra Padilla and
Planning Faculty Coordinator Jon Celesia

Ex-Officio: President, Vice-President(s), Academic Senate, Classified Senate President, ASU President, SLO Coordinator (Brandy Gibson)

Academic Senate President: Katie Krolikowski

Managers (4 voting positions): ~~Monica Rodriguez~~, Evan Decker, ~~George Mills~~, Rene Sporer

Classified (4 voting positions): Brandy Gibson, Christina Craig-Chardon, Demetria Lawrence, ~~Kate Weinstein~~, ~~Hector Moncada~~, ~~Vanessa Mercado~~

Faculty (4 voting positions): *Katie Krolikowski*, ~~Jeffrey Michels~~, Joy Eichnerlynch, Jon Celesia, Chao Liu,

Student (4): Vanessa Crissotomo, Carlos Solano, *vacant*, *vacant*

Composition in Planning Committee Charge in Handbook:

4 faculty, 4 managers, 4 classified, 4 student, VP (ex-officio) and President (ex-officio)
Quorum: 50% filled voting seats + 1 voting member. (i.e. 9 if all voting seats are filled)

All official members (including chairs, not ex-officio) are voting members; chairs may serve as voting members for their voting constituencies

Time	Item	Facil.	Documents & Outcome(s)	Discussion/Input	Decisions/Action Items
1. 12:30- 12:35pm	Introductions (if new people present) Confirm/Change Committee Membership Quorum? (9 voting members) Review Agenda (changes? Approve?) *5 min)*	Jon	Agenda (for this meeting) *Planning Structure & Charge*	MP: do we need to add any voting members and do we need to do any more recruiting? Does anyone know if we lost any classified members because we couldn't move the meeting? BG: I don't we did. JC: we are OK and today we are at 9. MP: Jeffrey still shows up when he can. BG: If Hector or Kate show up I'll move to SLO and they can be voting. ED: Move to Approve VC: correction and name spelling ED: Move to approve as amended DL: Second No objections, approved	
2. ~~12:35pm-~~ ~~12:40pm~~ 12:35pm- 12:45pm	*Minutes* (changes? Approve?) Review Action Item progress *5 min*	Jon/Mayra	Planning Com. Minutes 2020 11.06	ED: thought there might be a correction MP: suggests we table this until everyone has a chance to look at it. Corrections can be sent to JC.	
3. ~~12:40pm~~ ~~-12:45pm~~ 12:45pm -12:46pm	*Presentations from the public* *5 min*	Jon	Any topics or concerns we should work on or be aware of?	none	.
4. 12:45pm -12:50pm	*Marketing/Outreach Update* *5 min*	Jon	Brief Marketing and outreach status/update To Do List: Add a legend to explain 2F, 2C. 2M. 2S to the CCC Committee Schematic found on our website under CCC Committees. Note: can't currently create hyperlinks (certainly not to a jpeg) Will be meeting next:	JC: Neither Rod nor Larry will be at meeting; The legend/note about 2C, 2S, 2F, 2M (4 for PC) has not been done yet.	JC: contact Larry about the legend.
5. ~~12:50pm-~~ ~~1:20pm~~ 12:50pm- 1:52pm	*Program Review Work*: 1. Program Review Dashboard Review (10 min) 2. Common PR Themes—schedule the work (10 min) 3. eLumen Implementation (10 min) *30 min*	Mayra/Katie/ Jon	Homework for Break? 2020-21 Prog Rev & Validation Schedule SharePoint Program Review Folder DVC Training video link to their process DVC PR Guide link *Homework*: Everyone review and summarize thoughts by Retreat New Approach? Everyone review all of the 2019-2020 Program Reviews and we share and discuss at the retreat to finalize our report?)	1. MP: want to share Dashboard Beta test site. For those of you that have not navigated to the site before, I'll drop into chat a link to get to the tableau home page: https://tableau1.4cd.edu/#/home once in the tableau home page, you can navigate by using the search bar and type in "program review." The district has put together what we hope will replace our old WEPR shells that have the data embedded in them and this will be where dept chairs can review their data and this will be accessible any day, any time as long as you have VPN access. When I'm done, I'll show you two resources to navigate the site. If we need a data coaching session in Planning, we can do that. You see that the workbooks that were created were named the same as the sections in the Program Review. The data in here is not accurate. They just put fake data in as an exercise to look at the interface and make recommendations about what might be easier or if there's something that you were looking at in the Program Review in WEPR that you really liked that didn't make it here, let us know.	Noted by Mayra to bring feedback to district meetings.

			Access/Organization to find Program Rev to do the analysis *Common Themes Feedback*: Go through 2019-2020 ProgRev and look for campus-wide common 1. Requests and 2. Commendations (what is being done well?) *2020-2021Report*: Let's get this one done ASAP (May? September?) so we can present it to College Council and Budget Current state of WEPR; [WEPR Link] Explore next steps for incorporating eLumen Schedule for next 5 years [Program Review Cycle]	Information about Census fill rate and the Online fill rate and the3re is a comparison from the previous semester that tells you whether things are moving up or moving down. KK: I don't think that the correct approach is to say "Say what you liked from WEPR that might be missing" and just let it fly if this looks like a great new addition. I think we need to be very careful at saying "here is what program review used to contain, here's the new version and really make it clear which things are being proposed as new data fields and which are being proposed to be removed" because that is changing the process, so I think we have to be a little more diligent about lining up the old and the new here. MP: There is nothing that should be new here. Everything comes directly from WERP. There was no addition of data or removal of data. The only things that's different is the visualization of the same data. So what I meant by "let us know if you preferred what was in the old shell" I meant the visualization component. But the data should be exactly the same. It should be giving you exactly the same information. ED: Can all employees access from InSite? MP: Yes. Right now, this is in the beta so it's open as a "sandbox." So folks are just looking at it to see if it works. And the other two research deans are sharing it on their campuses to see what feedback is coming in. One of the things I would like to do is to get the dept chairs to play around with this a little bit to see if they find anything that doesn't match exactly what we had or if there are questions that come up and the data is not real. RS: When you said these are going to be a comparison from the previous semester, these are all going to be fall to fall, spring to spring. MP: …yes, thank you There were some things DVC didn't like, for example threshold markers and the language used made it sound like folks needed to get to a certain threshold. So if there is language here that for whatever reason doesn't sound like it's aligned with how we think this data should be used, please let me know. This is not going to be the only time that we dig into this. After we do the data component, you can play around with it and send me feedback. I just wanted to walk you through to see if there is anything we can communally bring up and then you can take some time and play around with it and then give feedback that way as well. The feedback at the district was that it is nicer to be able to see the trendlines. For productivity you can see whether things are increasing or decreasing, trendline by modality (hybrid, face to face, 100% online). Can look by program, dept, division, college. Able to filter by different programs at each of the sites, not just the principle colleges but the Brentwood and San Ramon campuses. Filter by year and session. That's the info in the first page. The second page gives you headcount info, again can filter (bay all), increases and decreases. Talking about changing "Minority group" to "minoritized group." The minority groups were collapsed so you could see "white" and "all others" and why do you want to do that? So she expanded the information that used to be at the footer and made it a new box (but couldn't figure out what to do with the top box). Headcount by group is easily visible.	

				CL: wondered if in the future, will there be a few people to design the visual. I've been looking at software… MP: this is only for program review, not tracking the strategic plan, so it's not related to this software. This is what you would look at to support Jon in writing the Program Review. JC: Did you say that everyone will have access to this? MP: I think now the permissions piece is being worked out, but I think the idea is that faculty should have access to all of the dashboard all of the time. The reason that this is fake data is that there needs to be some conversation s at all of the three senates. JC: Ultimately is the goal that eLumen will be linked to this? MP: Yes JC: or will this be populated into eLumen? MP: it can't be populated into eLumen unless it's "flat," so there will most likely be a pointer to the dashboard so folks can look at it live. You can see the number of courses has decreased, the number of sections offered has increased. Can see by modality the count of the courses over the different years and sections. Similarly, for FTES and the information over time and the same graph that was in the old PR as a table and you can hover over the data to see. So far, you've seen the tool bars having to do with enrollments and now I'm going to switch over to the student success ones. Course success information (C or better) and the % of students hitting that mark. …a reminder for us, we have an institutionally set standard that went through all of our participatory governance and, if I remember correctly, it was 72.5%. One of the conversations was that instead of using an average, we should use the institution set standard as a visualization. Katie can you bring this to Senate? The gray line is the average (of all modalities) and one suggestion was that we should visualize the institution set standard. JC: So the value is set by the institution? MP: yes KK: so it's just some sort of benchmark that you're asking to put the benchmark in this graph? MP: That's right JC: it's just made up on a hope and a prayer or what? MP: It's made up of ten years of data JC: That's fine, but so much has changed and… KK: I just want to clarify, do you want to have just one or both? Why would you want to remove the average? MP: I was trying to make it so folks don't have too many things to look at in one graph. The average really doesn't say much. Maybe faculty think it's useful for some reason. JoyE: I think it's good to have the average. I would rather see the institutional target put somewhere, maybe not on the graph. If we are looking at an institutional average than it seems we would want to see it for these classes. KK: We are not going to have an Academic Senate meeting where this could be discussed until mid-March. MP: It's a long term project because not all three colleges will be shifting into eLumen at the same time and we know the timeline is longer. It is just important for us to start beta-testing so we know the visualization is good for faculty. JC: What would be interesting to me is to look at our department's online success compared with the rest of CCC and compare that with DVC, how are we doing in comparison? Because what I can change are our online courses or our face to face classes since I'm going to be addressing that in my program review.	

				MP: So you're saying, Jon, that maybe we can put in a filter that has various, averages or thresholds so that we can say compare to the average of all four, compare to the institutional set standard, compare to the average for DVC, for example. JC: If that's doable. It might be a big ask, but it would be interesting. MP: I can ask. ED: I'm wondering in terms of the institutional set standard visualization if this box on the right hand side that says "Difference for Average = 74.6%" , if that might be the difference from the institutional set standard. So it might say 74.4% for the course success rate and that is 2.4 % higher than the institutional set standard. MP: You're saying maybe keep the average line where it is and make the comparison to the institutional set standard in the box. ED: Then you could list in that box "2.4% above institutional set standard which is 72%" MP: that's a good idea. Anybody else have any suggestions that coul make this an improved visualization? CL: Can the department request what is compared? MP: I'm going to come back with your input and DVC and LMC will come back with there input, but now we are having small groups look at it. Then we will share with department chairs and have them go through it and give input. It will be iterative until it is the final version. LMC, DVC and CCC have slightly different shells. LMC doesn't even use WEPR so they are using a different dashboard to look at their data, so we may end up with slightly different dashboards for each of the colleges. So we are keep it high level now. It will be an iterative process, so we will bring it back again. I'll bring the same comments back around course retention. Below you can see success by program, dept, division and college, so you will have some of that info. CL: it seems like we are interested in self-improvement and comparing to different programs might not give a good idea of what is going on. JC: there's a lot of analysis that goes into it. If you're going for better and better, 100% retention probably means that you aren't doing anything other than handing out lollypops. So theres' some capping and a lot of interpretation, but still it gives us something to think about. MP: and right now the prompts are pretty broad. So it gives you an opportunity to both answer the specific comparisons and to go outside of that if you see something that is exciting for your program based on something that you've done and been working on. This one can look based on demographics. We are thinking of changing from "unknown" to "not declared" or something; course success by disability status; by age bands—the size of the box is the number of students, the color is the success of the program. We need better, distinctive colors here. Does anyone have any suggestions? JC: ROYGBV, but I don't think we need anything less than 50% or 40%, but you can't say that 77 is less than 78. It doesn't make sense and it's not something worth thinking about. ED: and for some of the smaller programs where we have a cutoff of 10 students, it won't show the data … JC: again, what we do with this is where the narrative comes in MP: here by ethnic group; then go to awards JC: Christina may have asked this, too, but will we be able to see everyone's program review? The answer is ye, right? MP: No, the answer is that we don't know yet. That's why this is fake data. That needs to be negotiated with Academic senates. Our wish is to look at the dashboard modes and permissions will be decided later.	

				JC: It would be interesting to go into other programs and see their data. We probably wouln't be able to do that, would we? MP: we've had that discussion during accreditation. Some colleges make their program reviews public so there are examples of that, there's examples where they don't make the entire PR public but they make highlights public or pieces go into other documents that are public. Different colleges define what is public facing so we would have to make a decision. I don't know, Katie, if you want to make a comment on that. KK: I just think it's something to think about. I don't think it can be decided right here, right now. But I think there is value in being able to speak candidly for continuous self-improvement with colleagues and that's what the program review self-study is, and you only have so much time to perfect your language, so I'm going ot suggest that a plan would be to have a fair amount of the narrative internal with the validation team and the Planning Com, but then have certain sections that will be in a public place so that then you can spend more time writing what you want to be public. I think if we had the entire thing public, it would just take that much more time for every department chair to say things and they might not get to saying things that need to be said. I think it woudld be good to think about which parts would be shared widely and which parts would be good to use as a self-study because that's what these are. JC: Do any of you know if we did do something like that where we select what is public, can that be selected in eLumen? KK: eLumen can make reports. It's just a big database, so there must be some way to do it. MP: Moving on to Degrees and certificates; previous year change and 5 year change is shown, trend, average line; separation of certificates and degrees; Can expand the "condensed minority" to see individual groups JC: so middle eastern and Indian are considered white? MP: yes Certificates…any questions, any suggestions around this visualization? Anything that would make it better from your perspective? KK: It's just overwhelming. There's just a lot on one page. I wonder if there is a way to making it into 2-pages. I don't mind a busy page, but it's even busy for me. Maybe its fine. JC: It's nice to be able to compare them KK: yeah, I like the across comparison. I wonder if there could be the gender page and then the ethnic group page and..maybe it's fine. JC: You're a very detailed person, so if it bothers you, it will bother others. MP: I like that idea because this (condensed minority) really bothers me and this data is funky compared to the top visualization, so I think it would be really nice to have two pages, one just looking at gender and one looking at ethnic groups. Anything else? CL: one question about the graph on the left with degrees and certificates. The scale they put on them is the same scale. Will they be able to change it? The certificates will always be low and you can't see them to compare them or see the numbers. MP: got it. good point. One more page to look at with information about the number of faculty you have in the program. Total number, percentage and increase or decrease from prior year – headcount on left and %FT on right, FT vs PT numbers and percentages below that. ED: It does seem very busy. If all that's different between the top bars and the bottom is number vs percentage, can there just be an option for how you want to see it. JC: can just toggle or even put the number/percentage in one bar. MP: if you hover over the box, you can see all of the info; I'll ask.	

				Faculty demographics on top and then bottom KK: I know this is part of our WEPR shell now, but most departments don't have enough people to have this be a useful metric. I wonder if in the long term we can think about removing it from department and moving it to division-level analysis. At DVC, lots of their departments are large. I find this to be a silly metric for most. JC: we can skim over that which is silly or not informative KK: just want to throw it out to chew on it. MP: let us know what you think is Academic Senate and I'll brin git back to the folks in Planning. Similar FTEF view, so drop the same kind of feedback about being busy. JC: Can you just summarize what you just did for those that came in later? MP: The district office is creating a new data dashboard. It's just a different way of visualizing data that gets populated into faculty program reviews shells. Folks were giving feedback on what would make the visualizations better or more clear. We went thorugh all of the different section of program review. I'll drop in some comments into the dashboard so they know what we are thinking. I'll put the Tableau link in the chat. If you have VPN access, you can go into Tableau and start to play around with dashboards now. If you do not, then go to the ccc … There are state data, etc…orientation to the page At bottom is a district request for data Data Coaching Resources, installing VPN, …tableau training guide We can schedule a Planning Data Coaching and help anyone get on VPN and navigate through the dashboards ED: I'd really like to work with you and Vanessa to include CTE data and job outcomes, salaries, etc. MP: we would love it. It's top of the list, we just haven't made time yet. Vanessa has said that. JC: It's good to have the data and all, it's good some people are thinking about it. But when you are chairing a dept/program and working on classes, there is only so much you can do to really move the needle, right? And if there was a magic answer…what about all the decades of work that people did where the needle hasn't moved? Is the goal of the validation team to come in and say "Did you think about this aspect and you could do this." Am I supposed to listen to them? And should I be messing with my telescopes or messing with data? KK: I think that's an important point, Jon. I think that these metrics and what you might do to shift them is not the purview of the Planning Com. I think the validation team is to ensure that a department has considered the metrics and has taken steps to reach out for the broad variety of campus resources. But the validation is just that. It's validating that the department has done a self-study. So I would encourage us not to feel like experts in how to fix a program, but perhaps the Planning Com could have a higher view of what resources are available and not say you must do this, that or the other, but these are resources that come time mind. Validating is just validating, it's not judging. That's my perspective JC: it would then be the role of the Dean to maybe say "Hey, let's think about this or that." Not everyone is going to be able to analyze the data and I	NOTE: Go to contracosta.edu About Institutional Effectiveness ED: work with MP and Vanessa to include CTE data and job outcomes, salaries, etc

				wonder how much real work can be done by looking at that data. It may be because of my inability to come up with something that will make a difference. This comes from many years of seeing people talk about things and never seeing the needle move and see what moves the needle is hiring great faculty and people and their ability to work with students. I'll say that years ago a data person said, when I was in the office, "Look at this retentions rate. 89%! That person is great." And I'm going "Man, I'd like to see what their exams are like. That does not reflect our students as we have see. I don't want to create a culture where everybody is spending so much time digging through something and you come away with nothing. MP: I'll give you two really practical examples. The Math Dept and the English dept looked at data to set cutoff scores to set . Based on that research, they were able to move more students through completion through math and English. And there was lots of work there around those things . And then the other one, I wish Jeffrey was here, but in one of our equity-minded conferences someone suggested that group activities before a test could help prime them to do better on the test. I think he made one pedagogical and said "Huh! They were right. I saw increase in student success." So I think that there are different ways to use data and it should not be used as a hammer, it should be used as a tool when you are trying to refine something. And not everything needs to be refined. So, it's a balance, right? We need to make some stuff available and folks can pick and choose what speaks to them and to the way that they are looking at the curriculum development and their program development. There's different ways to use the data. JC: It matters how administration see it, too, and how it's being used in terms of whether it's a hammer or not. So I appreciate that perspective. 2. JC: We had talked about homework on common themes. It's still worth doing. Has anybody done anything on looking for common themes in validated program reviews. MP: I recommend that maybe the leads just jot down some ideas, just big picture aha things that showed up in their reviews. And then bring those back to the next meeting. Do folks think that is a good way to move forward? ED: It's fine with me. MP: none of the validation team leads are here and Katie is not here. JC: the leads can certainly ask the whole team. MP: we have a folder that has all of the validations that we've completed, so folks can find that. Maybe, Jon, you can pop the link in the chat and we'll just prep for that a little better. 3. eLumen implementation was Katie's so we'll pop back to that.	Validation Team leads jot down ideas, just big picture aha things that showed up in their reviews. And then bring those back to the next meeting.
6. ~~1:20pm~~ ~~-1:40pm~~ 1:52pm- 2:05 pm	*Validation Continuous Improvement* 1. Validation Leads review last semester work and decide on next steps	Mayra/ Team Leads		MP: Last semester, the validation team leads met. They worked on creating a document. I'm going to share to see what that culminated in and talk a bit about this timeline so we are all on the same page. Evan, would you like to lead us through this? ED: I haven't looked at this in a while. We reviewed it in December. MP: we did, I just want to remind us of what commitments we made and how we're going to move forward.	

	2. Proposal for Validation team data coaches *20 min*			[went through Best Practices timeline Sept-Oct; October; October-December; Dec-Feb; …where we should be starting our work this semester, but we don't have all the leads here. Was that Rene? RS: Do you want to know where we are? We've done an introduction. …(Reported progress and need more information before calling a follow-up meeting.) ED: met as a team in early Nov and communicated to all of our programs. Two are pretty much complete and waiting on some data. Third one, faculty is on medical leave and not sure what to do. Will touch base this coming week or two. MP: I suggest we onboard Dr. Rogers, our new VPI, so maybe we can call a meeting with all of our Val leads so she has a sense of our process. I know Monica and George are not here, so I'm not sure where they are with their process and communication with their teams. I think Monica's were good. Evan and Rene, do you have programs that were left over from the previous year? ED: I can comment on George. He reached out to me since Workforce is being evaluated buy them, so I'm sure he has done that with the other programs as well. We have had a few that we followed up with from previous years. Most folks have followed up or at least we have made some type of plan. For CTE program that had missed an additional year, we just put some comments in that program review to see the next program review. But everyone was pretty responsive. JC: Are you using the new extension process? For example, with the person that is on medical leave. MP: I believe it went to College Council. Katie do you remember if it got approved. KK: I don't know. You can look at the minutes. MP: Any new data issues? All got resolved that came up. ED: Some type of data training prior to being responsible for completing a Program Review would be helpful. MP: Propose we consider having one person from each validation team be a data coach for Program Review. What do you think about that? JC: We'd have to be coached on how to be a coach MP: yes, we've developed a data coaching training. CL: will that be using Tableau? MP: No, it'll be using WEPR data tables because we haven't transitioned yet, so the data coaches would have to have some expertise around what those tables mean and where the data are coming from. And if faculty notice any discrepancies then what to do about those. JC: would that go into interpretation and use or just access and correction MP: just the technical support; we can discuss if things are up or down what does that really mean. Is anyone opposed to this? JC: I think it's a great idea since a validation team is a support for doing the report. MP: let's bring this up next meeting and make sure that Monica, George, Evan, Rene have some time to talk with your teams and see if anyone currently on the team would be interested in doing the data coaching piece and then they would work with me. So, we can build some infrastructure to support faculty.	onboard Dr. Rogers, our new VPI, so maybe we can call a meeting with all of our Val leads so she has a sense of our process Check on College Council approval of Self-Study (Program Review) extension process. AGENDA: each team have a data coach Katie, around the PR theme and the eLumen check-in (email Katie in advance)

7. ~~1:40pm -2:10pm~~ 2:05-2:	*Strategic Plan implementation* next steps/sub-committees *Moving the needle* *30 min*	Mayra	Spreadsheet to help organize work of sub com for how tracking Str Plan and outcomes, LMC use eLumen, DVC tracking… LMC is archiving Strategic Plan in eLumen	MP: Chao and I started an email exchange. We started collecting information about different SPlan tracking software. I reached out to Christina Paul and she sent me some information that she had from doing a lot of research for another group about a year ago. I'm going to be sending out an email to the RP folks asking if anyone has anything that's been working for them. Chao, do you want to talk about some of the background work you are doing to try and find some of this? CL: I created a slide for what I studied about this software. (Shared PowerPoint — Strategic Planning Software Evaluation). • Trying to understand what the software looks like and what other things they will present • Vendors might pay for comments and reviews, but… • They allow you to define objectives, collect data, track progress, analyze trends and predict outcomes • Create historical records • Make informed decision and link to resource allocation • BENEFITS: automatically collect performance analytics; save time managing projects; test decision scenarios in advance; develop historical performance baselines • Software features…Some link to project management – look at each of the projects to see if doing as we wish and on track. Feature include: Strategic planning; goal setting; Key performance indicators; milestone tracking; dashboard; predictive modeling and simulation. • COST: most based on per user cost, depending on how many people are using it ($3-21; $21-$229, $229 ,. Per month) • Show comparison link MP: my team and I use Asana and I love it. It's really easy to use, keep things organized, put dependencies in, send automatic reminders, interfaces with lots of other software ($13/ month per person, so must be selective who we have use it). JC: It'd be cool if each Action Team did it, but we've got a lot of Action Teams. MP: Yeah, we've got a lot of stuff going on. We should talk about how we want to make the decision CL: shared link; chose top 4 but can see other vendors; try free trials, see key features, cost, reviews Look at one initiative, shows different people doing different work and timelines, who is responsible and when/what to end the job. Calendar view, communications. All initiatives related to the job. Each company has a different way to show that. Probably more than 100 companies. Start with a few people using it, then maybe expand to all chairs or whole college to align their work to our goal. KK: It's not great on our campus to have some people with access to tools and being insiders while other people don't have those tools. So I think it's important for anyone that could use it to have access.	*Comparison Link* www.getapp.com/collaboration-software/a/asana/compare/adaptive-planning-vs-monday-com-vs-jira/

				MP: and this brings us back to the budget allocation process. We need to figure out how an organization of our size, about 500 employees, can have access. We really need to think through that. JC: can we use the COVID money? We've got a lot more coming, right? ED: one thing I wonder I appreciate that comment about everybody being able to use it. Is it identified that the tools available in Office 365 are not functional, are not useful. Trying to talk to Mojdeh, she says these are all the things we pay for, here's what they do…So before going through that process, is that what the response to the District is going to be or is this just to track our Strategic Plan? MP: I'm think just to track our SPlan. Process, however these types of software don't require maintenance. That said, it's tricky in the sense, to Katie's point, everyone would like to use tools that will make us more effective but not everyone is going to like the same tools. I particularly don't like the stuff that's in the suite. It's not easy to use, it's not very intuitive, it's clunky. ED: I totally get it. That is thoughtful just in terms of the communication that this is for this purpose of tracking the Strategic Plan, these people will be using it, and that's the purpose of it. JC: Could there be a handful of people, in terms of SPlan, could the Action Teams meet with whomever has this tool and sit down and put it into this framework and get some sort of plan out of that? We've got this structure where we've got these Action Teams and they are going to report to some other level of organization. MP: You can interface with some of the software platforms without being a paid subscriber. There are some functions. I could send out an email to my entire team and say "Respond back and attach this thing" and then that could be attached. And then it lives on the software, but they don't have access to set dependencies or to set things in a calendar -you're the only one that would be able to do that, but I can request things from the team, they come in, and I organize them however, as a lead, I'd like to see them organized. CL: I think we want to try the software first. Are they hard to use? What about data collection? Will they all be able to access the data we already have or do we have to manually input the data or can it be done automatically? If we want everyone to be able to access the software, then we need to the software to be easy to understand and easy to use. To have that, we really need to try it. Once we adopt it, if it doesn't fit, we are wasting money and time. Is it possible to have a few people try it, it's a free trial, so try it and see. Zif it's easy to use, we can talk to the vendor to get more detailed information about what kind of thing they can offer. Some of them can customize to your needs as well. MP: I was going to suggest that we talk about the process. There's lots of software. Chao sent a link and I'm going to reach out to Christina. It's not reasonable to have everyone look at everything. Do we want to build a small team that works with Chao and myself to distill to maybe 5 or 6 or 4, even, and then come back to the3 committee and have a conversation around the pros and cons of those. Maybe even test drive those for a month or something. What process do we all want to engage in to decide which one we want to purchase? RS: If we're test driving, are we going to test different products or one month bring one in and then the next month another, not that that's a bad thing, but how long do you need to use it before you know if it works or not? what's the learning curve to make you feel comfortable using a particular product? Or do we buy features offered buy salespeople and weigh how well it's presented to us and then use it for a year. How hard is it to change after that?	

				How hard is it to change after a year? Is it a horrible thing or is it doable to keep trying products until we get the one we like because that's going to make us more efficient and more willing to use the product? MP: Good question, I'm going to pass tha over to Katie and let her make a comment and then do a closing. KK: When you're going to buy something, you should really have a god idea about what you want and have that really clear. Just because something is a neat feature doesn't mean you will have any use for it. I think it's really important to have a clear list at the outset of what we want the thing to do for us. And then, with those particular criteria in mind, check a few and see which one does it the most pleasantly. And not explore every possible feature of these products, but just think about the things we need doing and then try those things in a couple of products and pick the one that is the best design. MP: Just to wrap us us, we won't make any decisions today, but the spreadsheet that I created, I took at look at various other colleges to see what they created and I took a look at what they were tracking, and some of the bells and whistles that some of the services offered and put the list together. So maybe when our agenda goes out, I'll send just the header of that file to see if any of you have anything to add to that. And then we can use that information to compare the features, like Katie said. Rene, yours is a deeper question that I think requires us to think a little more strategically. We may find that 3 products have similar options and if we can get free trials, I would suggest that we do a test run of what it would mean to be the lead asking for the different pieces of information. And then maybe Rene, Chao and myself (just making this up right now) take each topic area and run through one example of getting all the pieces together and then we compare notes. So all three wouldn't have to use all three products. And then we can share that information with the group. JC: can we also check if some people on campus or the district use this and we can get their review or sense of it? People that have spent the time rather than going the whole Curricunet -> WEPR -> eLumen route. You've spent time with Asana. That would be great if we could talk with folks. I don't know if people use this regualarly. MP: Yea, I can share some of my experience using different project management software, but I've never had to track a Strategic Plan which is much more humungous than anything I've ever had to track. I think that's were some of the RP advise and Christina's input could be useful. So, it's time for us to end the meeting. The other thing to expect from me is information about a meeting in late Feb for all of the leads to prepare us for a March meeting with all of the stakeholders that will be moving into the SPlaning phase, so we'll be moving in parallel. And…the puppies have arrived. Stella and Luigi	…expect from MP information about a meeting in late Feb for all of the leads to prepare us for a March meeting with all of the stakeholders that will be moving into the Strategic Planing phase
8. 2:10pm- 2:30pm	*Annual Goals* <u>Reminder:</u> Annual Goals-homework Common Themes-work *20 min*	All	<u>Draft 2020-21 Annual Goals link</u> *<u>Annual Goals Feedback</u>*: Areas did well, came up short, recommendations for this year, do less/do more, anything	tabled	

			important to discuss that we haven't included?		