



Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
 September 15, 2014  
 MB 212  
 1:00

Present: Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Laura Vasquez, Vivian Baker, Gale Lebsock, Sarah King, Suzie Ama, Michael Carley, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent: Heather Ostash

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. <b>Call to order</b>	C. Marvin	1:00 p.m.		
2. <b>Approval of Minutes &amp; Action Items From May 12, 2014</b>	C. Marvin	Action items: From May 12, 2014 <i>Action Item – No action items for review</i> Minutes from May 12, 2014 – Approved as submitted		X
3. <b>Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. <b>ACCJC Follow-Up Report</b>	C. Marvin	We addressed everything in recommendation 2 with the exception of “and a means to evaluate planning processes for effectiveness.” We have fully addressed the recommendation, creating a formal systematic evaluation process which is now in place and has been fully implemented into the planning cycle.  Next report is a Midterm Report due October 2015. IEC and the Accreditation Steering Committee will be responsible for the report. We won’t have any real surprises. In 1996 there were 196 action plans. In 2012 we really cut it down and it really made a big difference. There was a lot of training and implementation, with revolving doors in the President’s office and the VPAA office.  The District-wide Strategic Plan will serve as our basis for implementing the Thoyote. One of the important things to be completed will be the Institutional Set Standards. Also, review of the College Mission.		X
5. <b>College Report Card</b>	C. Marvin	Every year we have had a college planning report card and contains same three things: SLO’s, Program Reviews, and Institutional Planning. IWV did goals for Program Review since we did not have program review committee at the time. Institutional Planning we		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>had at one time but what is the point to that? We talked about putting into place a new instrument. We made a change and did the 300 word narrative and did a score at the last IEC meeting last year. We used ACCJC score sheet to score ourselves. We did our self-evaluation and score of self-evaluation. Question – do we continue to do a college report card? We could do an annual report card based on the assessments we do for each of the planning areas. An example of the new report card was provided.</p> <p>Review of new report card format:  Background explains why the change.  Planning – overall score, proficiency statements with individual score and where it fell on the rubric and where we fell short and how to get to the next level. Using the term ‘minimally’ is probably not the best use of terms. What about the use of ‘solidly’? That seems to be okay. Change “Proficiency Statement” to “SCQI Statement”. Employee groups are not getting the information from their representatives. Need a better feedback loop to the faculty during the budget process (what was/was not funded)? Need a rubric for budget development.  Program Review – three areas; the first two are solidly meeting the expected practice. The third with a score of 3.33 falls below the standard but there are plans in place for improvements.  Student Learning Outcomes – 4 of the 6 areas solidly meet the expected practice. CCCSSE, ATD, and Student Equity will all provide additional information and provide the student support needed.</p> <p>Are we okay with this type of summary of what we did in the Spring? Idea about numbering – good idea to keep 4.22 or 3.89 but make sure the language is clear and matches what we decided. Include the range of scores in the legend.</p> <p><b><i>ACTION ITEM: Make changes and add the legend. Send out the revision to IEC group for review. Responsible Person – Corey Marvin Completion Date: September 29, 2014</i></b></p>		
6. <b>Goals for 2014-2015</b>	C. Marvin	<p>Recommendations: Get CIC approvals in sync with Program Review and SLO Assessment.</p> <p>What can this group do to ensure to engage people – the two words are communication and involvement. We are an organization made up of people and there will always be people that are not involved. But how do we maximize the involvement</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>of those who want to be involved? There are more people involved in each of the areas than they realize.</p> <p>Goals – Suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Revise webpages so that the information is easy to locate – Governance page is a really good example.</li> <li>2) Summary of all governance committees can be found on the college council minutes. A summary of CIC approvals would be helpful.</li> <li>3) Being informed/being intentionally uninformed about budget, CIC approvals, college planning processes, etc. How do we handle division plans 11/15, and sections plans 12/15? How do they get presented and looped back around?</li> </ol> <p>Planning Website idea – each department would have a link to their department page and the page would house multiple pieces of data for multiple years. AUPs, Program Reviews, Mid-Year Updates, Data, Budget, etc.</p> <p>How do we get through to the faculty chairs that write the department unit plan in a vacuum and do not involve the faculty in their department? This goes straight to what the survey points out; a lack of communication and involvement.</p> <p>GOALS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Greater Communication</li> <li>2. Higher Level of Involvement</li> </ol>		
7. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	<b><i>ACTION ITEM: Make changes and add the legend. Send out the revision to IEC group for review. Responsible Person – Corey Marvin Completion Date: September 29, 2014</i></b>		X
8. Future Agenda Items		Thoyote		X
9. Future Meeting Dates <del>September 15, 2014</del> October 6, 2014 October 20, 2014 November 3, 2014 November 17, 2014 December 1, 2014				
10. Adjourn	C. Marvin	2:44 p.m.		X

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

**O** Open/**C** Closed