



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 May 12, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

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

Absent: Michael Carley and Gale Lebsock

| TOPIC | FACILITATOR | SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP | O | C |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Call to order | C. Marvin | 1:05 p.m. | | |
| 2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From April 21, 2014 | C. Marvin | <p>Action items: From April 21, 2014</p> <p>Action Item – Create the annual assessment report scoring sheet which includes the rubric and send to IEC committee members. Responsible Party – Corey Marvin</p> <p>Completion Date – April 25, 2014 Completed</p> <p>Minutes from April 21, 2014 – Approved as submitted</p> <p>Will try to get Thoyote nailed down prior to first meeting in the Fall.</p> | | X |
| 3. Approval of Agenda | C. Marvin | Approved as submitted | | X |
| 4. Annual Assessment Report Scoring Results | C. Marvin | <p>5 exceeds norm of expected practice</p> <p>4 solidly meets expected practice</p> <p>3 barley meets expected practice</p> <p>2 doesn't fully meet expected practice</p> <p>1 doesn't meet expected practice</p> <p>Annual Assessment Report – Planning - Total Average Score: 4.0</p> <p>1. Score: 4.0 - Program Reviews are done every two and five years and the mission statement is reviewed every three years and we seems to be out of sync. We have been doing planning for the past three years and with the assistance of ACCJC we have improved the Program Review process. The systematic process of evaluating the processes seems to be missing. We have</p> | | X |

| TOPIC | FACILITATOR | SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP | O | C |
|-------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>not had time to close the loop fully. In 2017 the process will fully close the loop and all Program Reviews will be completed in a fully satisfactory manner. It was suggested that we stay with the average unless someone has changed their score after this discussion has closed. As we do a better job we will see our scores improve. This score will serve as a baseline.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Score: 3.625 - We will see some common threads. Currently we do not have a good public web presence. You can go to CurricUNET to look at SLO's but you can also see the test questions, which is not good. So we have some work to do in this area. One adjustment to the scoring on this rubric – from 5 to 3. 3. Score: 4.25 - ILO's have not been through a full cycle so this sections received a lower score. 4. Score: 4.125 - We have information posted to the website, but that isn't the same as communicating our planning processes. Our website is difficult to navigate. The instructions for navigating the site have been removed, but we are not sure why. We have not had the opportunity to step back and look at our website to see what we are providing – we need to offer the community the information they need in an easily accessible manner. SLO assessments need to be available to the public. <p><u>Annual Program Review Assessment Report – Total Average: 3.667</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Score: 3.875% - We have the components to complete the process. The program review process has never been stagnant, and who should complete program review has been a debate as well. The program reviews that have come through have required some major improvements, the level of analysis, and the conclusions that should have been drawn did not take place. The program review committee will continue the improvement of the quality of program reviews. 2. Score: 4.0 - The process is brand new, or radically changed over the past few years. 3. Score: 3.125 – We have not completely closed the loop on this yet. Disaggregated data for subpopulations cannot be obtained according to the District IR's. <p><u>Annual SLO Assessment Report – Total Average: 3.688</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Score: 3.625 – When it was discussed that statement number 1 was about the process being in place one committee member adjusted their score. | | |

| TOPIC | FACILITATOR | SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP | O | C |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>2. Score: 3.75 – No evidence to prove we are doing this and dialogue is a difficult thing to prove. The language is so strong, we have pockets of it, but there are also there are pocket where this is not true. Where are the students involved? Or should they be? Students have served on CIC in the past where curriculum is discussed. But it would not be appropriate for students to sit in on department meetings where the faculty are discussing new or improved courses.</p> <p>3. Score: 3.5 - We have the process in place, but not all department programs have fully assessed. We are not doing this to the full extent that we could, and there is room for improvement.</p> <p>4. Score: 3.5 – Using the assessment through the annual planning process to evaluate what is best for the institution.</p> <p>5. Score: 3.5 – How do we communicate the assessments broadly?</p> <p>6. Score: 4.25 – No discussion because this was already addressed when the college addressed the ACCJC recommendation.</p> <p>The aggregate scoring sheet indicated 9 respondents and only 8 scores. The aggregate scores will be revised to include all 9 scores. Corey will write up a report for the next college council meeting.</p> | | |
| 5. Survey Results | C. Marvin | <p>What do the survey results say? We had 101 responses and 70% were from faculty (approximately 30% adjunct). This is a baseline and the survey will be given every year. Places to improve – budget development process, weakest scores in college planning. We may need to consider administering the planning piece in the fall immediately following the completion of the unit plans. We need to make a more user friendly public face, get faculty more involved, and adjunct faculty more involved.</p> | | X |
| 6. Annual Unit Plan Template | C. Marvin | <p>Small revision for next year – all areas will look at disaggregated data for next year to look at any equity gaps. Educational administrators will look for plans to fill the identified gaps. Additional revision budget committees’ prioritization change will go out the faculty chairs in August.</p> | | X |
| 7. 2014-2015 Meeting Schedule | C. Marvin | <p>This time frame seems to work for all, once every two weeks. It is easier to cancel a meeting.</p> <p>September 15th next IEC Meeting</p> | | X |
| 8. Review of Action Items | C. Marvin | No action items | | X |
| 9. Future Agenda Items | | | | X |

| TOPIC | FACILITATOR | SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP | O | C |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 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 | | 2:58 p.m. | | X |

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed