



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 February 10, 2014
 Special Meeting
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Laura Vasquez, Heather Ostash, Vivian Baker, Bill Locke, Gale Lebsock, Michael Carley, Josh Sine, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent:

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1:02 p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From	C. Marvin	Action items:		
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Assessment	C. Marvin	<p>We received the follow-up letter from ACCJC on Friday stating we are still deficient on recommendation #2. The letter states that we have made progress we still need to further integrate all of its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, identified goals and a means to evaluate planning processes for effectiveness. We need to establish our rubrics, develop the surveys and have the first round of assessment completed before the summer is over. It will be too late to complete this in the fall, we have a follow-up report due in October.</p> <p>Planning Cycle: Porterville's process: Planning - survey SLO's - evidence of change/adjustments Budget Reviews Budget/Resource Allocation Survey The process Porterville uses seems to be much easier.</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>We are using the rubric from ACCJC for sustainable continuous quality improvement. There are times it can seem vague. Loop back improvements, and</p> <p>(IEC) Planning – Corey Marvin and IEC group (SLO) SLO's – Vivian Baker (PR) Program Reviews – Corey Marvin (BDC) Budget/Resource Allocation Survey – Gale and budget development committee</p> <p>Rubrics are ready by March 31st Assessment is final by April 30th</p> <p>Corey and Gale will work with Michael Carley on refining the survey to fit Cerro Coso's needs.</p>		
5. Thoyote	C. Marvin	<p>Made changes we discussed last time. We are getting there. Strategic goal 1 has been refined to become the goal to foster student success.</p> <p>Strategic Goal 2 is about student engagement in and outside of the classroom, affinity, and satisfaction.</p> <p>Strategic Goal 3 is responding to community needs. Identify and meet educational goals, provide business and industry workforce training, and connect with the community.</p> <p>Strategic Goal 4 is to ensure institutional effectiveness. Remain fiscally sound; provide safe and healthy environments; promote excellence in employee development; meet and exceed internal and external college planning and assessment; and promote participatory governance.</p> <p>This may begin to serve as a score card for the college. We need to pick data points that will be useful for the next several years. If we have the right purples and greens and the right data points, we can begin working on getting a bunch of feedback on this all semester long. We are one step one and the example is on a multiple step process. We will begin to add and develop and further refine the process. Will we be at a place where we can say we have made progress to successful student completion and this is how we did this with the various data points?</p> <p>The Thunion was a very visual report with color coding and placing percentages based</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>on the importance of specific data point.</p> <p>The bench marks we placed in our report will be used to determine where we are at. We will be held to the benchmarks and the team members will place importance on well we have done on each of the areas we set for ourselves. This comprehensive assessment measure we are currently working on has all of that information.</p> <p>Area 2 needs to be more fully completed before our next meeting.</p> <p>Gale please check how 4.2 aggregates with M & O AUO's.</p> <p>Jill where does IT, PIO, Community & Contract Ed, and HR fit into this?</p> <p>Corey will work with Library & LRC.</p> <p>Heather will work with Access, Student Activities, Financial Aid, and A & R.</p> <p>Michael Carley will send the CESSEA information to Corey for the next IEC meeting.</p> <p>We are currently tracking the number of student and athletic activities. Student government elections, athletics, etc.</p> <p>The student experience survey needs to be revamped, and Michael Carley will work with Heather to refine.</p> <p>Corey will create a matrix and share with the group.</p>		
7. PLO's		<p>PLO's there are programs that have never been assessed or need to be reassessed. Programs that are not new and need to be assessed. What are the consequences if they do not complete the PLO's assessment? All programs that have not completed PLO's need to be completed by Spring of 2015. This would mean every program that has not completed a PLO would need to complete it by Spring 2015. Programs that are currently active and have not completed the PLO assessment</p> <p>Send two messages, encourage them to complete the process over the next few weeks and get it off their desk which will allow us to include these in the report to ACCJC to report higher completion numbers. We need to make the ACCJC expectations known, which, are our expectations as well. We are trying to be helpful and providing the information as to why we are being helpful. As a We can provide a consideration for</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>this time, if we require the PLO's Spring 2014 and their program review is not due until 2016-17, we will make a ONE-TIME consideration to not require those programs to update the PLO's again in 2014-2015.</p> <p>ILO's fall under the responsibility of college council and they will determine what the best</p>		
7. Future Agenda Items		None		
8. Future Meeting Dates August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 October 21, 2013 November 4 18, 2013 DATE CHANGE January 13, 2014 February 3, 2014 February 24, 2014 (added 2/3/14) March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
9. Adjourn		2:22 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 March 17, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Bill Locke, Laura Vasquez, Joshua Sine, Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Vivian Baker, Suzie Ama, Heather Ostash, Gale Lebsock, and Tammy Kinnan.

Guests: Valerie Karnes, Matthew Jones

Absent: Michael Carley

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1: p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From February 3, 2014 & February 24, 2014	C. Marvin	Action items: From Action Item –None Minutes from February 3, 2014 & February 24, 2014 -		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Institution Set Standards	M. Jones	The ad-hoc committee determined that “If” indicates no standard. Do we want to break out online and on-ground numbers? Ad-hoc committee said yes, but academic Senate said we should not break these out. Reporting completion rate number as percentage not a number. AS said no to reporting. Immediate – ACCJC due on 31, march. Various people working on the report. Last year we were asked to report on 5 categories, success, retention, number of completers, licensure pass rate, and employment rates. ACCJC External Evaluation Team Responsibilities for compliance with US Department of Education Regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards effectively address “success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission,. . . including as appropriate consideration of course completion, State licensing examinations, and job placement rates.” • Whether institutionally-developed standards to demonstrate student success are 	X	

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>being used by the accreditor in the accreditation assessment, and the institution's performance with respect to student achievement is assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards effectively address the quality of the institution or program in: "ensuring that any awarded academic credits/degrees/credentials conform to commonly accepted practice including time invested and content mastered." <p>Accreditation is a choice, and we pay dues to be a part of the accreditation process. Without our accreditation status, students are not a required. There are groups of faculty that may not be pleased about standards being set, and it can become a political football or not, do we want to play football or not.</p> <p>Faculty are concerned and there is a great deal of push-back from last year. Reporting standards that are not necessary to report. Are we hanging ourselves?</p> <p>We were pressed to report and did what we thought was best for the college and students by reporting. As an institution we should have 5-6 things that are important to us. They may be the same as last year or may be different. They should be at a level which we are not comfortable slipping below that standard. If we do fall below the level, we need to have a plan in place to get back to the level of SCQI. When colleges ignore the process it presents an issue during the visit.</p> <p>Legislation has recently been enacted and we currently have the opportunity to take advantage of having control of where we go with this right now. If we ignore this or try to go three levels below we will be given more defined direction and the opportunity will be taken away.</p> <p>The mission of the college drives the direction of the college and how we serve the students is directly linked to the mission.</p> <p>It's not ACCJC that the faculty don't trust, it is the State that they do not trust. The State is dictating what the faculty will teach and the AA-T/AS-T degrees are a sign of this. The specific conversations related to how ACCJC will affect faculty specifically will make a difference. We will all be measured on a different scorecard and three other measures. One is FTES per student and one is FTES per completion. So now you either tell your side of the story or decide what you are going to do about the story. Defining the standards if it said "if".</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>This is what we reported last year:</p> <p>Course Completion – 66%</p> <p>Student Retention – 35% (fall to fall) (“persistence”)</p> <p>Student Degree Completion – 225</p> <p>Student Transfer Completion – 75</p> <p>Student Certificate Completion – 55</p> <p>We would review the Institution Set Standards every three years.</p> <p>Continue as we have in past, and then place on three year review timeline. Indicate on report that we are on a three-year timeline with strategic plan and mission. This will be reviewed next year with the standards and also included in the participatory handbook. We did our best guess with the limited time to work on the report and in the future we will have additional information from Achieving the Dream implementation and will be able to better assess the and address in the future.</p> <p>Action Item – The ACCJC Annual Report will be included in the same review cycle as the standards, mission, strategic plan, and will be included in the participatory handbook. Responsible party – Jill Board. Due Date – April 21, 2014.</p>		
<p>5. Program Reviews</p> <p>a. Liberal Arts: Math & Science</p> <p>b. Liberal Arts: Social & Behavioral Science</p>	C. Marvin	<p>Liberal Arts: Math & Science – Weak, return for revisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong form used – used last year’s form not current form • No appendix • Program strengths, weaknesses, three and six year goals were the same for all three program reviews. • SLO and PLO assessment was very weak. Did not list plan to fix. • A list of PLO’s would have been helpful. Programs don’t have capstone classes. • Math was not addressed • Did not address other campuses <p>Liberal Arts: Social & Behavioral Sciences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong form used – used last year’s form not current form • No appendix 		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program strengths, weaknesses, three and six year goals were the same for all three program reviews. • SLO and PLO assessment was very weak. Did not list plan to fix. • A list of PLO's would have been helpful. Programs don't have capstone classes. • The verbiage was way to similar for each of the LA program reviews. <p>We need to make sure each of the statements are accurate and can be validated. The program review committee will take over from this point forward on all program reviews.</p>		
6. Survey	C. Marvin	<p>Sub-heading were added for clarity. There were changes made to the survey. The survey will be out for a few weeks and we will share the results once they have been collected. We will be putting a public face on many of the areas via the website. This is the survey to evaluate our effectiveness, and we have the survey that will evaluate College Council. This is all part of our report out in the fall along with College in Review. This is something that needs to be reported out and if the results are available, they can reported out in May at the Classified Appreciate Day. People will be more likely to respond if they know when the results will be released. People are looking for the information from the climate survey that was done just recently. This survey and the survey from College Council will be conducted every Spring and the results will be disseminated during the Fall Faculty Flex Days.</p>		
7. Mid-term Progress Reports	C. Marvin	<p>Due March 1st, not a huge amount of participation and only ½ of them were received. Reminded faculty chairs to complete these. There were to serve as a check in at the mid-year point for what they said they would do. They should go to Budget Development for review to determine if the money was used for the requested purpose. We are not to the point of determining effectiveness yet. Most take the budget development process must more seriously now that they are asked to come to BDC for clarification. It will provide information on departments that are making progress towards their goals and effectively using their resources. It should also go to the faculty chair meeting. There is no direct connection between goals and the dollars allocated.</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		AUP changes for equity – the information that faculty chairs get is disaggregated. There may be a slight revision to prompt any specific disaggregated data patterns.		
8. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	Action Item – The ACCJC Annual Report will be included in the same review cycle as the standards, mission, strategic plan, and will be included in the participatory hand book. Responsible party – Jill Board. Due Date – April 21, 2014.	X	
9. Future Agenda Items		None		
10. Future Meeting Dates August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 October 21, 2013 November 4 18, 2013 DATE CHANGE January 13, 2014 February 3, 2014 March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
11. Adjourn		3:14 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

Open/ Closed



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 April 21, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Laura Vasquez, Vivian Baker, Suzie Ama, Bill Locke, Gale Lebsock, Joshua Sine, Corey Marvin, Heather Ostash, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent: Jill Board and Michael Carley

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1:05 p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From February 3, 2014, February 10, 2014, February 24, 2014, and March 17, 2014	C. Marvin	<p>Action items: From March 17, 2014</p> <p><i>Action Item – Action Item – The ACCJC Annual Report will be included in the same review cycle as the standards, mission, strategic plan, and will be included in the participatory hand book. Responsible party – Jill Board. Due Date – April 21, 2014.</i></p> <p>Minutes from February 3, 2014, February 10, 2014, February 24, 2014, and March 17, 2014 – approved as submitted</p> <p>Survey has been out for about two weeks and there are about 84 responses prior to the last email appeal. The survey went out to all employees. At the last District VP meeting BC show cased their version of the Thoyote and we will take a look at it. The Thoyote is a list of institutional measures that is basically a score card for the institution. We have four foundational measures. We currently have a working draft. It will go out next year for vetting. We will determine how we will track the progress. Bakersfield has theirs based on data horizontally rather than vertically. Our data is based on the goals of the college, so our data flows down to support those goals. BC has theirs up on their website with tabs and is now gathering feedback and providing dialogue opportunities.</p>		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Review of Annual Assessment Reports and Survey	C. Marvin	Please review and score the assessment reports using the scoring sheet (Corey will send this out soon) prior to the May meeting. Please come prepared with your ratings	X	

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>and ability to defend your score. We will discuss this as a group.</p> <p><i>Action Item – Create the annual assessment report scoring sheet which includes the rubric and send to IEC committee members. Responsible Party – Corey Marvin Completion Date – April 25, 2014</i></p>		
5. Revision of College Council Self-Evaluation Survey	C. Marvin	<p>The rubric was developed last year and college council asked IEC to revise it. The paragraphs contain too much and need to be separated. The committee worked on breaking out the stakeholder information from the committee information. IEC created two separate sets of questions. The revised rubric will be submitted to College Council for review at their next meeting.</p> <p>In the future the participatory governance should be included in the planning survey as an additional set of questions.</p>		X
6. Annual Unit Plan Revision	C. Marvin	<p>There are no major changes. Equity – a specific question about student performance gaps for student populations. Professional development – this piece is broken and currently the VP's pass along the requests. We need to include professional development in the AUP's and should be tied to department goals. We need to include justification. There should be some sort of marketing or outreach at the unit level.</p> <p>It is important to keep the AUP changes to a minimum this time around.</p> <p>There have been discussions about the possibility of changing some of the areas from a unit plans to section plans. If they feed directly into a Division Plan they should be Section Plans not Unit Plans.</p>		X
7. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	<p><i>Action Item – Create the annual assessment report scoring sheet which includes the rubric and send to IEC committee members. Responsible Party – Corey Marvin Completion Date – April 25, 2014</i></p>	X	
8. Future Agenda Items		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Thoyote • Annual Assessment Report Scoring Sheet • Annual Unit Plan Template • Set 2014-2015 Meeting Schedule 		
9. Future Meeting Dates August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 October 21, 2013 November 4 18, 2013 DATE CHANGE				

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
January 13, 2014 February 3, 2014 March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
10. Adjourn		2:58 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed