



Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
 September 30, 2013  
 MB 212  
 1:00

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

Absent: John Mercer

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. <b>Call to order</b>	C. Marvin	1:04 p.m.		
2. <b>Approval of Minutes &amp; Action Items From August 19, 2013</b>	C. Marvin	Action items: From August 19, 2013  <b>No Action Items</b>  Minutes from August 19, 2013 – approved as submitted		X
3. <b>Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. <b>Thunion</b>	C. Marvin	Cerro Coso has a whole series of indicators that are missing actionable objectives. We are either too specific or too broad. The Richland Report seems to be more precise, clear, and a way to make it meaningful.  The Thunion report is to help determine where we are any one point in the year, and if we are improving or not. We can begin dialogue, and use IEC as the test case.  We have a collection of data which is not widely reported out. We have a start with the AUP's, Section Plans, and Division Plans, but not everyone will read all of those plans.  The goal will not change, but the data points will. There is a systematic way to address each area. Moving forward with current strategic plan and work with the data points that line up with what is important and what gets directly at the plan. We are not changing our strategic plan, we are enhancing what we have. Start with something that is meaningful for our campus that will enhance our strategic plan. The usefulness of		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>the Thunion report is to help determine the importance of the data points which will enhance our strategic plan. How do we want to move forward with something like this? President Board recommended a boarder committee discussion – sub committees derived from College Council.</p> <p>IEC should begin the process and provide a starting point for the process by identifying data points that will be vetted through College Council. The goal will not change, but the objective may need to be adjusted and we track that information as we go through the process. Corey likes Bills idea of tossing out a wide net and getting ideas back from all on what types of data points we should consider. The document will go to President’s Cabinet as a new template with our data for discussion about data points.</p> <p>This format is not just for the strategic plan, but it can help with other planning areas.</p> <p>Will take goals and objectives and the data point we currently have and then determine what additional data points we will use. This will be presented at the next meeting. There is no specific timeline for this. Having the dialogue is key. Over the summer management and IR will work together to populate the report.</p> <p>Tagging could be included to indicate where the data feeds from/into. As an example – the College In Review Document, Professional Development, Student Services Report Card, etc.</p> <p>All of us separately will brainstorm; use the strategic plan and we will pull all of it together at the October 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. President Board will bring back the administrative feedback that she receives.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a first draft of our version of the Thunion report to the IEC group. Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b></p>		
5. Department Pages	C. Marvin	<p>We have been asking departments to track their goals; where will that be seen, posted, and tracked? The page would include goals and the action taken to accomplish the goals by department. This is a way of holding groups accountable, and all of this information in one place. The page could serve as their working page to include</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>budget, goals, actions, etc. This is currently a weakness of our institution</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of Mira Costa recommendation on department pages for the group to review. Share the Mira Costa website location for this. Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b></p>		
6. 5-Year Program Review Cycle	C. Marvin	<p>Currently we are in a 6-year cycle which creates a great deal of work during some years. The accreditation team was concerned that we are in a 6-year cycle and we should consider moving to a 5-year cycle. President Board believes that the change would be a good baby step and with the states’ frequent changes we will be ahead of the game.</p> <p>The recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Chairs and College Council on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – Faculty Chair - October 14, 2013 and College Council - October 17, 2013.</b></p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Senate on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. Responsible person – Laura Vasquez. Completion Date – October 17, 2013.</b></p>		X
7. Institutional Learning Outcomes	C. Marvin	<p>ILO’s – Currently we have ILO’s, but how useful are they to the institution? When the accreditation team was here there was a discussion about which institutions have ILO’s and which do not. PLO’s are required, but ILO’s are not. In the most recent ACCJC report completed we were asked about ILO’s for our institution. Are we going to do them and if so what will they look like? If it is completers then you can build into every program, not necessarily every class. Through ATD there might be a common theme/thread that emerges which can and may only be addressed and assessed as an ILO.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of the ILO’s and current assessment for the IEC group.</b></p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<i>The planning document (Suzie's Report). Responsible person – Tammy Kinnan. Completion Date – Thursday, October 3, 2013.</i>		
<p><b>8. Goals</b></p> <p>a. Develop a comprehensive and integrated means for evaluating planning processes for effectiveness.</p> <p>b. Determine the proper role of institutional learning outcomes in the College's planning and self-assessment processes and establish a plan for moving forward.</p>	C. Marvin	There was a brief update of where we are in the planning process and where we have moved forward in developing a comprehensive and integrated means of evaluating the planning process for effectiveness as well as developing the proper role of ILO's in the college planning and assessment process. We have taken steps in the right direction with the self-assessment of College Council and working integrating all planning documents.		
<p><b>9. Review of Action Items</b></p>	C. Marvin	<p><i>Action Item – Provide a first draft of our version of the Thunion report to the IEC group. (4) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>Action Item – Provide a copy of Mira Costa recommendation on department pages for the group to review. Share the Mira Costa website location for this. (5) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>Action Item – Report to Faculty Chairs and College Council on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – Faculty Chair - October 14, 2013 and College Council - October 17, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>Action Item – Report to Faculty Senate on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Laura Vasquez. Completion Date – October 17, 2013.</i></p> <p><i>Action Item – Provide a copy of the ILO's and current assessment for the IEC group. (7) Responsible person – Tammy Kinnan. Completion Date – Thursday, October 3, 2013.</i></p>		
<p><b>10. Future Agenda Items</b></p>		None		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
<b>11. Future Meeting Dates</b> August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 October 21, 2013 November 18, 2013 January 13, 2014 February 3, 2014 March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
<b>12. Adjourn</b>		3:05 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

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

DRAFT



Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
 October 21, 2013  
 MB 212  
 1:00

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

Absent:

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. <b>Call to order</b>	C. Marvin	1:04 p.m.		
2. <b>Approval of</b> Minutes & Action Items From September 30, 2013	C. Marvin	<p>Action items: From September 30, 2013</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a first draft of our version of the Thunion report to the IEC group. (4) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b> On today’s agenda.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of Mira Costa recommendation on department pages for the group to review. Share the Mira Costa website location for this. (5) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b> Completed. Every unit that does a unit plan should have a page. Would make planning information more transparent.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Chairs and College Council on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – Faculty Chair - October 14, 2013 and College Council - October 17, 2013.</b> The response from the faculty chairs was tepid at best, but they understand the logic. The Academic Senate response was also tepid.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Senate on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Laura Vasquez. Completion Date – October 17, 2013.</b> Complete</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of the ILO’s and current assessment for the IEC group.</b></p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p><i>(7) Responsible person – Tammy Kinnan. Completion Date – Thursday, October 3, 2013.</i> Complete</p> <p>Minutes from September 30, 2013 – approved as submitted</p>		
3. <b>Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. <b>Faculty Hiring Rubric</b>	C. Marvin	<p>This has been popularity contest in the past. Last spring ad-hoc committee worked on new process. Rather than whole senate voting exec council works with VPs and scores based on rubric and that information goes forward to the president. Rubric on front and back has information that faculty chairs are asked to respond to in AUP. Data was supplied in trend sheets at the beginning of the year. The chairs respond to the questions 1 – 7 in the AUP using the data provided and they do not just list the numbers. They analyze the data, and make decisions based on the information/data provided. The smaller colleges have disciplines that have one person departments and the vacancy can create a loss of a department. The rubric consists of data points that compare with the data points in the AUP. The comparison is with other disciplines, not departments. We hire in disciplines not departments. This rubric fits the instructional faculty. How do we handle the library and counseling? We need to create a rubric that fits these areas, which may require two very different rubrics.</p> <p>Addition - Other conditions – something that may influence the need for a new hire- outside influences.</p> <p>What if we also had a brief qualitative rubric in addition to the rubric provided?</p> <p>This is a good start, and needs a Beta test. The Chancellor needs the list of possible positions by November 4<sup>th</sup>. The chairs would like the opportunity to meet with the committee rather than rewriting their AUP's to address the new rubric. The meeting needs to be next week and the revised version should be in the hands of the faculty chairs right away. Next year they will receive the formal version and meetings will not be required.</p> <p>We need something similar that is relevant to the counseling and library.</p>		X
5. <b>Institution-set Standards</b>	C. Marvin	The College needs to come up with institution set standards for course completion, student retention, student degree completion, and transfer to 4-year colleges/university. Where is the appropriate place for this conversation? This was discussed at the last faculty chair meeting. Most colleges just provided a rolling		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>average. The idea is to begin meaningful dialogue about the standards per ACCJC. Do we have different standards for on-site and on-line or are they combined? This should go to the district VP meetings and determine if it will be done as we always have-average. The student success and support council should also be included.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Take the institution-set standards to student success and support council meeting for discussion. Responsible person – Heather Ostash and Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 30, 2013.</b></p>		
6. <b>Thoyote Draft</b>	C. Marvin	<p>The handout was reviewed in detail. Goal 1 – missing student services data points. We are keeping the current strategic plan, and working on the data points that will work with what we have, and we are also collecting data points that will enhance our next strategic planning steps. We should not be too specific as the goals may change. There are some data points that are enduring and track-able.</p> <p>Climate survey, college in review, and score card are available for additional information.</p>		X
7. <b>Review of Action Items</b>	C. Marvin	<p><b>Action Item – Take the institution-set standards to student success and support council meeting for discussion. Responsible person – Heather Ostash and Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 30, 2013.</b></p>		
8. <b>Future Agenda Items</b>		None		
9. <b>Future Meeting Dates</b> 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				
10. <b>Adjourn</b>		3:05 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

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





Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
 February 3, 2014  
 MB 212  
 1:00

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

Absent:

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 November 4, 2013</b>	C. Marvin	Action items: From November 4, 2013 <b>Action Item –None</b> Minutes from November 4, 2013 – approved with changes – The program review committee has not been finalized yet, it is still in progress.		X
3. <b>Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. <b>2013 Comprehensive Assessment Report</b>	C. Marvin	Committed to have annual assessment per ACCJC. This is a wrap up of the previous year. Assessments are finalized in October and the report is finalized in December each year and provides a snapshot of where we are when assessment is written. We need red list similar to that of CIC with deadlines. This would help identify courses due for update and identify when department is not meeting deadlines or requirements. The committee has never not approved the assessment, but will be moving in that direction. The committee will make recommendations for improvement. The departments cannot ‘plan to plan’ any longer. They will be required to be much more specific. Creating a cycle for assessment the year prior program review being written was proposed at the faculty chair meeting and met with a bit of resistance by some. What happens when the department does not complete the work necessary to complete the SLO assessments? It should be treated the same as it is in CIC. In the areas where we do not have a full-time person would we recommend providing release time for a part-time faculty member to complete this task? We only have a		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C																				
		<p>couple of disciplines – Philosophy, Paralegal, and ASL. A written presentation submitted to the college President will help in the decision making process. The PLO’s have to be revised the year before the program is written. Some of the SLO’s are tied to the PLO’s so do we want to uniformly say the SLO’s have to be done at the same time as the PLO’s or let the departments decide? PLO’s must be completed the year prior to writing the program review. The SLO’s can be completed in the year or two prior to writing the program review.</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="924 535 1764 779"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">SLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">PLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Program</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">SLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Review</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> </tr> </table> <p>Training for our part-time faculty also requires follow-up after the fact. We can create an SLO and Program Review handbook and make sure it gets out to everyone. Will the new Program Review Coordinator be on the SLO committee? Yes, that is a good idea, they will also be on IEC and CIC.</p> <p>Assessment denominator statement needs to be clarified in the report. The denominator needs to be the students that are still in the class and participating in the assessment.</p> <p>We need to get a handle on the program deletion process or we will get caught though gainful employment. We need to clarify the deletion process and make sure that all areas are cleaned up with each deletion.</p>	1	2	3	4	5			SLO’s	PLO’s	Program			COR’s	SLO’s	Review				COR’s	COR’s		
1	2	3	4	5																				
		SLO’s	PLO’s	Program																				
		COR’s	SLO’s	Review																				
			COR’s	COR’s																				
5. <b>Thoyote Review</b>	C. Marvin	<p>Goal 1 Foster Student Success -</p> <p>Goal 2 Improve Student Affinity and Campus Engagement</p> <p>There is student success in the classroom and there is support outside the classroom. Ultimately they are related to each other. This goal is not as specified as goal 1 is. We</p>		X																				

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>need to specifically call out the online experience as well, we also need to call out early alert. A category of follow-up services, or early intervention. Maybe capturing AUO's for customer services in the Administrative Services, Financial Aid, A &amp; R, Counseling, etc.</p> <p>The student experience survey would be conducted every two-years. It needs some extensive revisions. We will be doing CCSEESS this year, and we don't want to over survey the students. Heather and Michael will work together to revise the survey.</p> <p>2.2 should be directed towards the students and whether or not they feel same on campus. Goal 2 is specifically geared towards students and should remain that way. The employee satisfaction information can be moved to Goal 4.</p> <p>Goal 3 Respond to Community Needs</p> <p>Who are our underserved population? Are we getting them here and once here are we serving them? How does a number tell us we have met their need? Just because the number goes up or down does not mean you have or have not met the need.</p> <p>The idea of 3.1 was there is a demand out there that we are meeting. But when it goes down does it mean you are not meeting the need? Not all measures have to go up, some you actually want to go down.</p> <p>3.2 Currently contains CTE FTES and maybe it should be focused on community and contract ed. CTE makes sense because they provide certificates and immediate employment training. Add number of community members on advisory committees.</p> <p>Goal 4 Ensure Institutional Effectiveness</p> <p>4.1 is the fiscal piece for the college.</p> <p>4.2 is employee performance and development and we need to begin tracking employee professional development.</p> <p>4.3 needs a name change. Assessment &amp; Planning Measures for Continuous Quality</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>Improvement.</p> <p>Next meeting is March 17 but we have several program reviews. Cancel faculty chairs on February 24 and we will schedule IEC 2/24/14 from 1:00 – 3:00. Corey will send the program review rubric out.</p>		
<p><b>6. Assessment Instrument of ourselves</b></p>	<p>C. Marvin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.</li> <li>* There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.</li> <li>* There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.</li> <li>* There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.</li> </ul> <p>I've asked you to think about how these four bullet points can be assessed.</p> <p>In a similar way, the Program Review and the SLO committees will be using the bullet points at the SCQI level in their rubrics (attached) for the same purpose. So far, so good.</p> <p>It occurred to me yesterday that we could do a version of what the ACCJC did for SLO's. In 2012, they asked colleges to submit a report in which the college 1) addressed every bullet point in the rubric, 2) cited details, specific instances, and evidence, and 3) wrote no more than 250 words per bullet. The colleges turned this report in and then were subsequently graded (as you have seen) on a 1-5 point scale for each of their answers.</p> <p>So we do a version of that: the three committees submit a simple report at the end of the year, which would be narrative in form and address all bullet points--say by April 30. They keep the answers to 250 words per bullet and cite evidence. And then IEC scores the narrative according to rubrics we develop, which would happen in early May.</p> <p>What I like about this is 1) the reports are concise and focused, 2) the tasks are well-defined and delimited: the committee writes a descriptive summary in everyday language on its side, IEC applies the rubric on its, and 3) summary and evidence are</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>presented just like they would be for an accreditation report.</p> <p>One obvious asymmetry is that IEC would be writing and scoring its own efforts for institutional planning. I don't see anyway around that unless College Council does it. Even if IEC does it itself (which I think it should), the steps will be separate enough.</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p>In the end, it would be these four reports (budget development would have to be included) completed annually and the survey done once every three years that constitute our evaluation instrument. We could even discuss doing the reports less often than that--every two or even three years if yearly is too often, if there's not enough change year to year--as long as whatever we do is on a regular basis.</p> <p>Budget Development committee evaluation – was the process followed appropriately? The budget committee should determine if they followed the process and did the right dollars go to the right place. How do you ultimately get at that information? How do will the budget development committee know if the dollars were spent appropriately? Did dollars follow program improvement? One piece missing are the priority numbers. How does the budget committee know if the dollars directed to a specific program are used as intended? ACCJC will ask how we know the dollars are used to best serve the educational needs of the students</p>		
7. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	<i>None</i>		
8. Future Agenda Items		None		
9. 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				

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
10. <b>Adjourn</b>		3:03 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

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



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. <b>Call to order</b>	C. Marvin	1:02 p.m.		
2. <b>Approval of Minutes &amp; Action Items From</b>	C. Marvin	Action items:		
3. <b>Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. <b>Assessment</b>	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: <span style="float: right;">Porterville's process:</span>            Planning <span style="float: right;">- survey</span>            SLO's <span style="float: right;">- evidence of change/adjustments</span>            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 31<sup>st</sup>  Assessment is final by April 30<sup>th</sup></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 &amp; O AUO's.</p> <p>Jill where does IT, PIO, Community &amp; Contract Ed, and HR fit into this?</p> <p>Corey will work with Library &amp; LRC.</p> <p>Heather will work with Access, Student Activities, Financial Aid, and A &amp; 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. <b>Future Agenda Items</b>		None		
<b>8. Future Meeting Dates</b> August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 <del>October 21, 2013</del> 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. <b>Adjourn</b>		2:22 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

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