



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 1, 2011 8:00 – 10:00

MB 212

AGENDA

- 1. Committee Status Report**
- 2. AUP Template**
- 3. ACCJC Rubrics**
- 4. Program Review Template**
- 5. Educational Master Plan**
- 6. Other issues**
- 7. Future topics**
- 8. Archiving**
- 9. Next meeting in two weeks**
- 10. Create regular meeting schedule**
- 11. Adjourn - 10:00 a.m.**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 1, 2011 8:15 – 10:00

MB 212

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Heather Ostash, Matthew Crow, Suzanna Ama, Claudia Sellers, Tammy Kinnan

Absent: Tina Tuttle

1. Committee Status Report

Still finding our way on this committee and deciding what our role is. Creating processes and trying to refine. Looking at AUP template, it is becoming much more refined. C Y H spent time working and looking for feedback from this group. ACCJC rubrics handed out for review. Program template review let departments know ASAP who is responsible. Educational Master plans update long discussion at VP meeting. BC process is almost identical as CC process worked out over the summer. Other issues, Suzie would like to talk about SLO strategies.

Committee status update where this committee was discussed. The charge of the committee was reviewed and what the committee is doing. Recognized that what the committee is doing is important. This committee responsible for all of our oversight of all intuitional planning budgeting processes and the evaluation and proves if it is working and documented. This committee will have oversight of and evaluation of will affect all aspects of the college. Heather would like to hear the rational of why this committee may not fit into the participatory governance process. PG by definition is huge but this does not need to be a large group. Where does this committee report out?

When flow chart was presented at College Council was presented there was a decided that fell over the table. How did all groups fit in and the necessary work load.

Action Item - Corey will contact Jill to determine where the determination is and where this committee reports to.

2. AUP Template

Corey made a few changes to include specified groups that are involved. Marketing was added where appropriate, as well as IT. As we refine the documents there will be a few changes here and there. Our December 15th document does not necessarily need its own name.

What would be an appropriate tool to use that would allow the faculty to complete the template. Microsoft word is capable of that. Karen O'Connor is willing to create the document. Web based is also an option and capable of this. It would be more desirable in terms of attachments. Suzie Ama can complete the web based template. The archiving piece is very important – how to design capturing the information and where is it housed. It needs to be someplace that is accessible for every, easy to update, and no need to run around 2 months prior to accreditation. Where is the planning for what is best for our institution in the long term planning process for housing



documents? Corey is weary of all the shadow processes. Currently it is nearly impossible to locate information. Unit plan can best be accommodated by a database. Defining the needs will help identify the technology needed. Develop a process and who places the items where appropriate. Counseling has a share point site that houses all information. Heather is working with IT to create a channel (tab) in Luminous for the student services group and will serve as a repository. Groups in Luminous are different – groups are used as a dialogue. There should be minimal layers for using this.

AUP document is the end product after several conversations with Heather. Let Corey know if missing anything. Corey likes the steps instead of parts. Corey reviewed the handout with the group. Distance Ed needs to be a theme in all of our documents. The items on the template Step 1 lays foundation; Step 2 how is it related to current planning – do we need to add SLO information here and if so where – Heather if it is not here where else would that take place – outcomes? If not reviewing annually, where will this information be reported – every 6 years in program review? Yes SLO drive staffing, budgeting, resources. Assessed once in accreditation cycle, but it should be a continuous process so that all outcomes are assessed at least once every 6 years. Each outcome needs to be assessed once every 6 years. Collecting longitudinal data also helps. There is a balance between what is desired and what is doable. Need process that identifies gaps and how to address the gaps. Need a document that is no counterproductive to the process. Maybe add one additional field for a repository of all assessments. Reporting out of trends in the department is also important. Under review of overall program include trends – what has worked for your department. SLO's may come up under the measure of success area. Do we want to include previous SLO data to show up on the document?

Bring all data together, randomize and aggregate the data and begin a discussion in the department which will then lead to some digging to find why the course has lower success rates. Step 3 Justify resources – staffing, technology, equipment, marketing, and facilities. Timeline – Suzie will work on the form over the next few days to include some drop down menus for ease of use. She will work with Alison to place on the web right away. In time the appropriate place will be found and the document will be housed there.

Does it make sense to include this in the CurricUNET?

ACTION ITEM: Corey will invite Mike Campbell to the next meeting to discuss the possibilities of Luminous. Corey will add this item to the faculty chair meeting agenda on September 6th.

3. ACCJC Rubrics

Letter from Barbara Beno handed out. Second page includes the Rubric of where we need to be by the time the ACCJC team arrives.

Student Learning Outcomes – awareness - achieved, development – achieved, and proficiency – in process (required by 2012) core courses must have assessments in place, no exceptions.

Institutional Effectiveness Program Review – awareness – achieved, development – achieved, and proficiency – in process.

Institutional Effectiveness in Planning – awareness – achieved, development – achieved, and proficiency – in process.

4. Program Review Template



Even the departments that do not have a program need to know if they are serving the needs of the students in all areas. Clarifying statement that indicates Program review needs to go out to each department that is affected for review. How many degrees fall into the multiple buy in - Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, Business Admin, and others?

5. Educational Master Plan

Decided among VP's that we would seek approval at the highest level to secure a consultant to write the environmental scan piece. Golden West Ed Master plan was entirely written by an outside group. Their report is very flashy with lots of graphs, charts, and photos. The outside environmental scan will be objective. The outside firm will have the ability to drill down. Golden west did both internal and external scan. District strategic planning process developed an internal and external environmental scan process. Heather will share with Corey. This is moving up the ladder in terms of being approved. Makes sense to have the external scan done by an outside firm. This information remains for multiple years. This forms the first piece, the second pieces AUP, and the third piece is the second level plan (facilities, IT, staffing, and marketing).

6. Other issues

7. Future topics
8. Archiving
9. Next meeting in two weeks
10. Create regular meeting schedule

11. Adjourn - 10:00 a.m.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 20, 2011

MB 212

8:30 – 10:30 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**
- II. Finalization of forms**
 - a. Annual Unit Plan (and update on fill-in method?)**
 - b. Top-Down SLO Assessment Sheet**
 - c. IEC Committee Charge**
- III. Annual Unit Plan and Program Review Master Lists**
- IV. Randomization Statement for Faculty Chairs**
- V. Revised Program Review Template**
- VI. Archiving Documents**
- VII. Future Meeting Dates – Create a regular meeting Schedule**
- VIII. Adjournment**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 20, 2011

MB 212

8:30 – 10:30 a.m.

Minutes

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Heather Ostash, Matthew Crow, Tina Tuttle, Suzie Ama, Claudia Sellers, Kim Kelly-Schwartz, and Tammy Kinnan

I. Minutes and Action Items

Action item follow-up - Corey spoke with Jill and we are a sub-committee of college council and report back to them, but not specifically a governance committee.

II. Finalization of forms

- a. **Annual Unit Plan (and update on fill-in method?)** - Heather included the staffing, the chart has a few new columns that are pertinent to classified. Kim asked why we are missing the adjunct piece. Coaches are not fulltime or classified so where do they fit? Corey not sure given the process and budget requests this would be true of each. This is specifically tied to resources allocation and adjunct pay is based on how you build your schedule. No proposal required for that, but coaching does fall into a different category. Maybe take FT faculty staffing off and make it more generic. If Kim is only exception then she can adjust personally and the form will not need to be changed. Detailed faculty staffing was adjusted slightly to clarify what is needed to request a fulltime faculty. If you can think of any other data that might suggest or support a particular faculty position, let Heather know. Where do we want to place this online? Suzie can create in Moodle or on our institutional website. Corey's preference is the website. Heather uses the website for accessing information. Given the dysfunction of all other options we should consider using the institutional planning location on the website under the faculty link. This is a clean area and items are labeled as you would expect. Archiving is still an issue, how and where needs to be determined. Needs to be saved electronically as well. Partnerships item C on the document has been added. After attending workshop at College of the Canyons this was added. No changes and will take to faculty chairs this afternoon.

Heather provided a handout for the prioritization of resources requests that will assist all in prioritizing the requests for budgetary needs in connection to the



Annual Unit Plan process. Theoretically the resource requests will tie back to the narrative in the plans. This will be used for all budgetary requests, not just academic. This will be a good guiding principal for the budget development committee. Corey would "E" to read "Meets Community Needs".

ACTION ITEM – Corey will take to faculty chair meeting today, September 20, 2011.

- b. **Top-Down SLO Assessment Sheet** – simply to have as a compliment to the bottom up and need to find better more respectful terms. Once CurricUNET is functioning this document will no longer be necessary. This is a planning document. The department still needs to get together and discuss the end result. This is a course assessment plan. The document can also be used for program learning outcomes as well. Will have many top down assessments in the spring for review.

ACTION ITEM – Corey will take to faculty chair meeting today, September 20, 2011.

- c. **IEC Committee Charge** – Hopefully the last draft of this document. The committee charge remains unchanged. The bullets under purpose were revised and combined. Heather asked about the last bullet, which seems very defined. Change to - provide oversight. Co-chairs will be the Vice President Academic Affairs and Academic Senate President. Suzie asked what this committee sees as their responsibility for SLO's assessment. What is the vision of this group for the review process? The Bakersfield College committee reviews each assessment. CIC used to do a form of the review but was not very good at it. IEC has prevue over the timelines, process, etc. over the program review process. The intuitional researcher has several faculty members that go directly to her for this type of assistance. Program review and assessment review fit together. The group that reviews the assessments should be the same group that would review the program reviews. Corey is thinking that Academic Senate would be responsible for this. A small committee of three or four would be a college resource for questions regarding SLO's, program review, and would include student services. One representative would be from student services. If possible select outside of CIC if possible to begin with. CIC will be highly impacted over the next several months. No expectation of CIC members to serve on the additional committee. Over time CIC might be a good place for this process to fall. There is the question of checks and balances. SLO coordinator – who does she take her direction from? It makes sense that the SLO coordinator would report to the IEC and provide oversight and direction to program review, unit planning, and SLO assessment



and review. Is it more of an Academic Senate committee or not? Probably not as the committee would need to be all encompassing. Corey will take this back to college council and the committee would be institutional wide and address all programs not just academics. This is a need of the institution.

ACTION ITEM – provide IEC charge and purpose to college council by Thursday.

III. Annual Unit Plan and Program Review Master Lists

Corey provided a list of annual unit plans which are split into different departments, the LAC, LRC. The sites will be second level (October 31 and December 15) will write mini business plans. Corey talked to Gale and she came up with M & O and print shop. Claudia asked about Administrative Services as a whole. Heather asked about how the executive summary will fall into place. What will happen with the business office, bookstore, food services, and Human Resources? Corey feels this will be a conversation at the VP's meeting tomorrow. Who will be writing this portion of the accreditation document? Why are they not writing plans yearly by campus? One role of this group is to say we believe it is important to make recommendations in the planning process and have those entities involved in our processes. Even though we have district HR, there is a local HR office that should be planning and setting goals as does everyone else. Institutional research, child development centers, and community education should also complete an annual unit plan. Heather explained what the purpose of the annual unit plan is. We will try IR as an annual unit plan for this year, and it may move to the second level planning stage next year.

ACTION ITEM – Corey and Heather will ask about the safety, bookstore, business office annual unit plans at College Council on Thursday and at the district VP meeting tomorrow.

Program Review master list – handout. The list indicates the program review due dates. Corey would like to provide a standardized list that will be available to all programs. List pulled from spring and tried to be all inclusive. Maybe this list should be floated through AS for review and any corrections. Every program review should be due in Spring each year. Go through process and be completed but can be done early. There is a great deal of clean up that needs to be completed. If program review not completed then our program discontinuance policy indicates we can kill the program. The state indicates that we need to divorce program discontinuance policy from the program review process. After the deletions the number of program reviews to be completed will be reduced. Any comments – nice to have the list. As far as SS with exception of articulation the same list has always applied for program review as the annual unit plans. How do we define a program? There are certain elements in the library that



makes it legitimate to complete annual unit plan but not program review. Program review will provide historical information and why we did what we did. If not considered a program do we ask the question – were they successful over the past 6 years. Anything that has a function should be held accountable and should complete a program review. Everything should be intertwined, so if the AC is out in the classrooms and students are suffering and therefore not successful this is going to affect the student learning outcomes. Do we want to look at M & O, A & R, etc in the same manner that we do for academic programs. The template will need to be revised. Do we use the same pipeline for all programs outside of the academic affairs area? Not all program reviews will need to go through CIC but what should the pathways look like? Is this IEC group involved, is the SLO group involved, what are the different groups involved? Think about this over the next two weeks.

ACTION ITEM – Corey will take the program review master list to college council on Thursday. What constitutes program review at the college council level?
ACTION ITEM – Define a program. Do we consider M & O a program?

IV. Randomization Statement for Faculty Chairs

Lively 45 minute discussion of sampling and randomization. Corey attempted to organize our reason for sampling.

If we are going to cluster we will need to stratify and then cluster to avoid the possibility of evaluating just adjunct or only online classes. This document will require a great deal of explanation on a continuing basis. Tina is getting a lot of questions from faculty regarding the SLO assessments that are not measurable. Working on tying assessments to institutional goals we are making progress. This document will put into play a few best practices. Perception is that if they choose cluster sampling I can tell my instructors ahead of time and they will know in advance about the data collection. Corey attempted to set up more viable process. Cluster sampling creates a degree of concern. One of the big hang ups is the reflection process within the departments. The tendency to rationalize away the report will be easy. The chairs will not be the people to choose the sections that will be evaluated. It will be conducted by a specified group. What is right is right, what is viable is viable, and what is objective is objective. This was a discussion at the last faculty chair meeting and will be discussed again at today's chair meeting. Suzie believes stratified sampling should be encouraged. Give our small size and looking giving the amount of artifacts we will have to look at will create some issues. Results should drive a more comprehensive checking of the data, see what we have and then consider a change. Chairs want this to be left up to them to choose which process is most viable for them. Then debrief and assess the outcome and this all goes back to the sustainable quality improvement.



Cluster and stratified cluster sampling is the most frequently used in the elementary school process.

ACTION ITEM – Tina will provide a random numbering table.

V. Revised Program Review Template

- a. **Archiving Documents** - Archiving is still an issue, how and where needs to be determined. Needs to be saved electronically as well. Admin cabinet discussed yesterday, looking at how to do that in a way that is organized. Will go to college council and have all college buy-in.

Handout – Instructional Program Review document. New with branding. Corey made a few changes, and those familiar with CurricUNET will recognize the format. Part 1 – relevance, part 2 – appropriateness, part 3 – achievement of student learning outcomes, part 4 – currency, part 5 – future needs and plans, and part 6 – supporting documentation. There are some additions to the document and this is Corey’s first draft, we can adjust accordingly. Question regarding justification of continuing the program in DE mode. Corey would like to have a specific list of what we need. Establishes consistency, provides guidelines, and all information will be based on programs which may cross departments. Suzie is concerned about the raw SLO data being made public. Suzie stated that 10% success is too low and not acceptable. SLO’s provide reasons as to why students either achieve or not. Not always related to poor instructors; there could be other issues, and this will help determine what is going wrong. Content review is much more arduous than originally anticipated. We need to capture statistical validation and we have not been doing this. BC science department has a good statistical evaluation process. This is fully a faculty senate issue and needs the approval of the Academic Senate.

ACTION ITEM – Matt will take this directly to Academic Senate for discussion and approval.

VI. Future Meeting Dates – Create a regular meeting Schedule

Requested to meet a bit later in the morning. Tuesday’s work better for everyone but Tina, every other Tuesday. Two weeks from today if conflicts with Tina’s district meeting we will shift accordingly. Hopefully when things stabilize we will we can move to a once a month rotation. Every two weeks beginning October 18, 9-11.

VII. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 10:50.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 29, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**

- II. Program Review Master List**

- III. Annual Unit Plan Master List**

- IV. Update on Annual Unit Plan Web Template**

- V. Next Steps**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 29, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Minutes

I. Minutes and Action Items

Corey completed all actions items Finalization of forms to faculty chairs, add location column in budget, Top down SLO assessment course planning sheet to chairs, and several had in this week's meetings. They indicated the type of evidence gathered.
College council approved

II. Program Review Master List

Matt will take to senate today, college council discussion regarding which program reviews from last page will be conducted. If doing annual unit plan then they should also conduct program review every six year.

Do we want to continue with the six year cycle? Different times for different units. Matt feels that more often is better. Bakersfield College has moved to annual program review which includes unit plan information. Our challenge is that our two documents are set up based on different things which make it difficult. Can we affect a closer relationship? Heather believes that we need to evaluate first cycle and then consider heading down that road. Changing now will derail everything we have already done. Program review on more frequent basis along CTE lines is more along the lines of what we need to do, and three years would be more effective. Every two years we are required to a 2 year review. Talked about doing every four years, and that suggests that we recognize the CTE areas are on different evaluative plan that other areas where things don't change as often. English and math will be changing if the student success initiative goes into effect and the impact of basic skills. Will we see decrease in faculty? If not conducting program review on more frequent basis how do we respond to changes. Many larger issues that colleges are dealing with and we need to touch base more often. Annual unit plans provide the opportunity to take a look at the operational piece of the department. Have we compared the AUP list and the PR list for the difference? Both documents were available at the meeting. Will one program review cover all certificates and degrees in the area (example: Industrial Arts). For annual unit plans there is no public service department wanted to break up into programs. Art, business, public service, science, etc. are all good examples of providing the opportunity to break up into several program reviews. Not all departments have degrees which take up back to the discussions in the beginning. Those departments would potentially fall under GE. What is a program? State defined in faculty senate document and up to the colleges to determine. Corey feels it weakens the effectiveness of PR that is focused on the awarding of some type of award. Does BC do program reviews based on departments – could be. We are



now basing AUP on departments not programs. In ideal world all courses should lead to an outcome. The gap is that we are missing GE breath treatment of why offering certain things. Need GE assessment. Lobby against silo program reviews. Question is how well are we preparing student to become welders? Are we doing a good job in preparing welders? Are you provided the appropriate resources? Only way to get at that is to look at viability of program that turns out welders.

Some programs are outdated and others are just due now. 35 are due at the end of this year. It is crucial that we work out some type of way to provide data to the groups that will need it.

III. Annual Unit Plan Master List

The annual unit plan master list was reviewed. Tina requested that she be kept in the loop with the discussions. There will be some programs that will be removed from the list. These discussions will take place at the Academic Senate and CIC. Any program listed in the college catalog must complete a program review.

IV. Update on Annual Unit Plan Web Template

There were a few changes made to the template and we need to finalize ASAP. Need to determine how to designate information, will we provide info or will we require them to look up. When do they need info on yearly basis? Wonder to what extent we can standardize reports in ODS and provide the access to faculty. ¾ already exists in ODS, problem is talking about developing for new programs will need to be done. They can be user friendly. EMSI does not come through ODS. Provide in useful chunks. How does this group wish to firm up? What data elements will be available? In spring semester the discussion regarding a template for program reviews. Program review template is available and we have been using for years. We do not have a fillable PDF document available right now. In previous years only had part 6 supporting documentation, we are now providing some guidelines on what type of data would be appropriate. The data will drive certain decisions and the narrative of parts 1 – 5. Question – do we want to provide information for subject and then into specific tab for the specific course, specific locations, etc. take a look at student demand and student performance in specific subjects and specific locations. Look at DE vs. traditional. AJ the academy should not be included the only course that will matter will be the 10 courses listed in the degree program. If two programs share course outside of discipline how do you determine which students are in which programs? Not likely this can be sorted out right now. Building a reference table, so that one person can select web design certificate and brings up all courses related to this. When another person selected different certificate it will provide all related courses. We may be double counting for now, but we do not currently have the resources available to make this determination. Raises separate issue – student in the major vs. the actual degree Aardvark Zoology certificate offering.

Program review is not expected for a program that will not be available active in the fall. The SB1440 TMC will be expected to provide a justification (which is much like PR) up front. Discontinuance – must have completed a program review. RP out, or never had one done or significantly outdated.



Who is the program review committee? Who is the chair? Maybe that committee will be responsible for the GE program review. There has been discussion about that committee and that was prior to the IEC formation. Discussions have taken place regarding a possible GE committee. BC has had general education committee for some time. The committee went away and they are now thinking that was a mistake. GE SLO's - GE is very important in the accreditation document. This committee would be important to focus on the importance of GE we don't have a philosophy on how courses are added to the GE, no specific philosophy, and those discussions have never really systematically taken place. We need a GE work group or committee to move GE forward

Enveloped and maintained the philosophy and SLO's, and worked with CIC on courses that hoped for CIC approval and addition into the GE pattern. Must consist of people who are willing to tell people no. A GE addendum may solve the same problem.

Once GE committee is pulled together all possibilities can be discussed and workable. Possibly a mapping of how courses relate, which must be reflected in topical outline and addresses in methods of evaluation that fits within the general education. Development of critical thinking skills is a general ed. requirement and easy to assess.

V. Next Steps

Waiting for senate to come back with recommendations for

1. Put together a basic site of AUP/PR resources for unit planning process with instructions - district strategic plan, college strategic plan, documents to reference and reflect on, data for position proposals, environmental scan, student success plan – short term
2. Revise if necessary the program review template for the other areas. Heather will review for appropriate use or will find other models for non-instructional reviews.
3. Use next meeting to GE SLO meeting – October 18 9- 11. Compare to DIRT and Consultation council.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 18, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**

- II. Annual Unit Plan Update**

- III. Program Review template**

- IV. Program Review Timeline**

- V. Comprehensive Assessment Reports**

- VI. Integrated Planning webpage**

- VII. Other Items from 2011 Strengthening Student Success Conference**

- VIII. Next Steps**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 18, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Heather Ostash, Claudia Sellers, Suzie Ama, Matt Crow, Tina Tuttle, Kim Kelly-Schwartz, and Tammy Kinnan.

I. Minutes and Action Items

September 20, 2011 minutes approved as submitted.

II. Annual Unit Plan Update

Suzie Ama and Kiana Wyatt are currently working on this and hopefully by the end of today the page will be accessible through the faculty group page.

III. Program Review template

The template has been redrafted, but is using the same format. Part 2 contains the program review information from CurricUNET. Corey removed some resources. Summarize student demand and student performance data will be provided. Not much other unusual or different. Corey did review the accreditation document and tie it together. Number 4 current costs - this is part of gainful employment. We need to elaborate on this piece. We can create a form and include the room and board information so we are consistent. Part 4 – SLO's are very important and tie directly to our accreditation. Part 5 – Should action items be along the same lines as the annual unit plans? Are there examples we can use – Tina hears this a lot from the faculty. We have had wide swings here. This committee's job is to create those items. Get documentation into the hand of those who have program reviews due in April. We need to continue to work on improving the process and the documents. We don't have a long standing process which shows cross-over of the departments. We need a place to describe program interactions. Heather has added to the non-instructional program review. Program applicability should include some sort of program interactions. We have both instructional and non-instructional program reviews. The Administrative Services program review has not yet been done.

The first group of program reviews is due in April.



ACTION ITEM: Heather will bring the non-instructional program review process.

ACTION ITEM: Matt will take the instructional program review process to Academic Senate for review and approval.

IV. Program Review Timeline

We have not talked about the timeline, the process, when due, who reviews them, who see them. Also, do we want benchmarks? A yearly comprehensive timeline?

Benchmarks and feedback need to be one prior to the program review completion and approval by Academic Senate. It will be very helpful to provide feedback early (technical review).

First review/technical review

Data to programs

IEC will serve as the technical review for consistency and completeness, then to the assessment group for trends, then to Tina for a review of data integrity, then to Academic Senate for review and approval.

Senate – End of the year

Assessment – April

IEC – February

1st draft is due to IEC February 1st and feedback will be provided by February 15th

March – faculty chairs will work on review and update.

Early April – Assessment

End of April – Academic Senate

May – To College Council

The faculty chairs are 100% responsible for the program review throughout the entire process.

Program Reviews will always be due in the spring.

Questions – shouldn't we be on a 5 year cycle? This provides a year off for the self-study.

Program review data due November 30th for this year. Need to set a guideline on what data will be provided. Corey and Tina are working together to ensure the data used is consistent across the board. Classes used actually make up the program. There are some classes that are not part of the program.

General Ed will need to have its own program review.

EMT may be the only exception and that is being corrected.

Gen Ed is up for program review.



The three liberal arts degrees are not up for program review.

ACTION ITEM: Corey will revise the instructional program review document

ACTION ITEM: Matt will take the document to Academic Senate for review

ACTION ITEM: Time line will be firmed up and shared.

V. Comprehensive Assessment Reports

Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are complete and updated on a regular basis – this provides a way of ordering and prioritizing. This is very specific. We need to have a cohesive integrated planning process. How SLO achievements are summarized and loop back to make the changes necessary to provide quality instruction is very important. The assessment group will meet after the annual unit plan submissions in October. How will the group provide feedback? The comprehensive report is college wide – will the comprehensive reports be individual?

VI. Integrated Planning webpage

We have SLO Moodle, need to pull and place on the new website.

VII. Other Items from 2011 Strengthening Student Success Conference

Each committee member received a hand out from the Strengthening Student Success Conference – Applying ACCJC Guidelines to SLO/Assessment: 2012 Proficiency into Practice. All colleges must be at the proficiency level. Are we there yet? In some areas yes, in others we are close.

Proficiency: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs, and degrees. Individual SLO's are tied to the PLO's here at Cerro Coso. Authentic Assessment gets at the leaning assessments and how we do them.

VIII. Next Steps



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

November 1, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**

- II. Program Review Template for Non-Instructional Areas**

- III. Institutional Planning Website**

- IV. Accreditation Standard Review**

- V. Meeting Dates**
November 15, 2011
November 29, 2011



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

November 15, 2011

MB 212

MINUTES

This committee has been assigned various standards for review. Today we will go over the standards that directly related to the mission of this committee. We will walk through these sections.

1. Review descriptive summaries with find eye and see if we are headed in the right direction. The guide will assist with this. We will talk about the approach we wish to take.
2. This will be the final process for the descriptive summaries. What do we wish to reflect in the evaluation piece?

1.B.1 Disclaimer – Christine is still working on this. There are some lacking and confusing areas; This section was written by several VP's. The areas in highlight are of concern and present questions. This section covers the participatory governance model. Provide feedback – do we wish to have bulleted lists, or paragraphs? Valerie will be asked to review the CTE section. This section should align very closely with the participatory governance document. If something is purely descriptive of what we do then it should be imbedded in the document. We should not make people go and look for what we do and who we are. We can also include the information as part of the evidence. Christine is working on condensing where possible. The descriptions were somewhat incomplete and there were paragraphs that seemed to be out of context. The Academic Senate and CIC were sections that need improvement. The new assessment committee is strictly an Academic Senate committee and it just getting started.

Does anything stand out at this point? After big black section there is a question regarding the IR participation with faculty chairs. She has not attended the meetings since June. She is a resource for the data needed by the chairs. She has been invited to CIC and will be attending in the spring of next year. Does the president still hold monthly forums? No not monthly, periodically would be more accurate.

The big black paragraph there were sections taken out and there is a question as to the value to this paragraph. This is a very informal paragraph and how should the fact that administrators attend the sporting events, barbeques, etc. How do you provide evidence for something like this? There is definitely an informal nature to our institution and that contributes to the college in fostering trust and relationships. We can document this in anecdote. Would our other campuses agree with the warm feeling? The other campuses will have the opportunity to provide input into the document. While the IWV campus is mindful of the distance we attempt to be inclusive. The feedback from the sites is that there is a delay in getting the resources to the sites. With the groups now available this has been improved greatly. Inside CC, CCCConfer, and video conferencing are definitely modes of communication.

The program reviews must go to college council. IEC will provide feedback at the beginning of the program review process. Does the PR go through Faculty Chairs? Yes, appropriate for presentation, but no approval, or very formal feedback. They could be reviewed in the same fashion as the AUP's.



Shouldn't we include information on the IEC group in this section? Talk about IEC as it relates to program review instead of how the AS revised the PR process. Christine will include information on the IEC which is a sub-committee of college council. It was recommended that IEC should be inserted just prior to 1.B.2. before the sentence "The institution articulates its goals and states"

ACTION ITEM: Heather will forward the written information on IEC to Christine.

ACTION ITEM: We need to include the student outcome assessment committee to include in this section – Suzie will write and submit to Christine.

1.B.2 – feedback – We do have a student success plan which has been presented at the faculty chair meeting. The report card is still in process and will be coming out as part of the discussion of strategic planning. Christine will incorporate the IEC information where needed.

Tina will rewrite the paragraph "Determination of whether the College is meeting ..." to be much more inclusive.

Please commit to finishing reading through 1.B and provide feedback to both Christine and Heater via email.

III.B.2 include the safety committee charge and function after the paragraph "Equipment is maintained..."

III.B.2.a Describe the district wide process for the environmental scan process as though it has already happened. Will the SRID process be included along with the Measure G Bond oversight committee? Will there be a rubric to score the physical resource requests? How AUP process includes how requests are evaluated. Budget development committee will begin looking at request and how they will be prioritized. This is part of the second level plan.

III.B.2.b. will need to be expanded, how does it fit into the educational master plan, include the AUP process, What are they looking for in the environmental scan looks at capacity, changes, BRAC, workforce impact, budget cuts at state, bond measures, RFQ sections should be plugged into the facilities plan.

III.C.2 can essentially use same description regarding how technology fits in. Include the replacement plan process; TRT has also been very active. AUP feeding into technology and how it feeds into budget. Very parallel as what was discussed for facilities. TRT will be one piece; another component will include Pedagogy and Technology. Also, include how the Director of DE will interact and be a part of this. Mike has had the opportunity to revise.

III.D.1.a. the conversation from today's budget meeting will help guide how this section will be revised. It will include how the AUP process is connected to the budget development process. It will be fleshed out today as a result of the conversation with the budget committee. It would be a good idea to indicate the prioritization process.



II.A.2.e. Highlight the statement regarding CTE program review every four years until it is determined if they will conduct the PR every 6 years or every 4 years. They are required to conduct a supplemental review, which is very brief, every 2 years. Basic skills are required to conduct a program review.

All programs other than CTE are reviewed every 6 years.

We need to agree on terminology when speaking about transfer vs. CTE. Transfer may not be the best, but academic programs vs. CTE are not good either. Not sure the connection will be made for Liberal Arts either. The implication is that CTE is not a viable program, maybe Arts and Sciences. Heather will check with other colleges for their terminology.

II.A.2.f. seems more focused on SLO rather than global institutional planning. Assessment fits and makes sense to include. But they are looking for something more than just student outcomes in this section. Sometime we are too light on the SLO's. Maybe beef it up a bit more on the SLO's.

G, H, and I do reflect SLO's. – If you have any additional feedback from these sections please submit them to Suzie and Heather via email.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

November 29, 2011

MB 212

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- I. Review ASP for Academic Affairs**

- II. Program Review**
 - a. On Tap**

 - b. Status of Senate Approval**

 - c. Data Availability**

 - d. Timelines**

 - e. Responsibility of IEC**

- III. SLOAC Committee: Charge and Responsibilities**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

November 29, 2011

MB 212

MINUTES

1. Approaching period of time where things are no longer forced to completion. Over next few meetings we will be discussing what needs to be refined and what is missing. Write down things that we need to discuss and complete. Corey has been reviewing AUPs and finding both good and bad examples.

Annual section plan – AUP due by 10/31. Next step is the division plans. Need a set of plans from CTE, ESCC, KRV, and Academic Affairs. Corey created something similar to the AUP template with a few changes.

Step 1 Program applicability

Step 2 Goals

Step 3 Resource Needs and we need to include staffing. Corey is pulling together all facilities, IT, and other resources. There is an evaluation piece that will help guide those who need this information and will be making decisions.

Step 4 Resources/Budget – things will be captured here that include the office of academic affairs.

Need to include student performance data. FTES, FTEF, etc. Need student performance data that include the divisions. Due November 30, 2011. Student performance data will not be required this year, we will begin with that data collection next year.

2. Program Review
 - a. On tap – There are several program reviews that are due.
 - b. Status of Senate Approval – senate has some concerns regarding the template. They believe the data should match more closely with the AUP. Corey shared that everything in AUP is covered by PR. There is additional data that is provided for the RP. Part 5 Future needs and plans – were doing three and six and why not 2 and 6 to pattern with CTE. Why breaking out data by section on FTES and FTEF. To provide reviewers additional information. We do not break out by course for AUP. Possible to provide the student performance data and that will be helpful. Concern that we have not targeted sections before. Repeated requests for section data. If the data is the same going through the process then this will alleviate the concern. PLO identified in part 1. Whole document should be drawing connection. Would it help if under future needs and plans to include instructions? This would be obvious place where summary would begin. Specifically identify trends and themes would be important. Not yet approved by Senate. Tina would like to change the order of elements to align to the documents.

Action Item - Tina will send the preferred list of how it might look to Corey.



- c. Data Availability –
- d. Timelines – have really talked about changing the current process we currently have. 2 reading at CIC and one reading at Senate, then on to College Council. Is this working? Do other groups need to see it; does this group need to see it? Tina thought we spoke about bring it here at the second to last stop. This group would possibly be a little earlier in the process to provide guidance. Data integrity needs to be verified in the early stages of the process. We need to make sure that the writer understands what the data meant and how to use it. There have been some creative uses of data in the past.

How many are we talking about? A total of 23 will be due. This year we will have 13 due. Will non instructional go through Senate. They have in the past so we should keep it that way. Student services do fall under the 10+1 so the senate does have prevue over this.

Possibly on the accreditation year we will do self-study and General Education PR.

In the past the SS has conducted the program review as a small advisory committee that is inclusive of a broad group, including faculty. Heather does not see that a PR by the A & R staff would be very beneficial. The instructional side has not used this process in advance. Essentially there have been no expectations to make PR a group effort; rather it is written by one person in the program.

Heather has seen other PR and the front of the PR has an composition expectation on the first page. Do we want to present that there is someone outside the unit to serve on the committee. Student Services will include one instructional faculty as part of the process. If we want to ensure that everything we do from the bottom up is to be all inclusive and focus on student success. Degrees with crossover this might be relevant to include someone from the outside. In an ideal world we would have someone with broader prospective, like counselor, that would serve on the PR's. The documents are core for what we will be doing. There is value in having someone outside the program on the committee. This may be a topic of discussion for the future. CTE is automatically supposed to include the advisory committee for the program review. There are other ways of gathering input without having a committee.

Is there any student input for the instructional program review? Students were supposed to be included on the committee. We will continue as we have in the past and continue with the discussion. This is all by way of recommendation by the Senate who has ultimate approval.

Action Item – Corey will draft timeline and submit to Matt for senate approval.

Action Item – Matt will gather feedback from the Senate regarding the change in process and including committee members.

IEC for technical review and data integrity – submitted by Feb 1st.

Assessment group will only look at trends and SLO's; they will also be looking at AUP's – early April.

Academic Senate – will either accept or not and only needs one review – end of April.

College Council – May

- 3. SLOAC Committee – large task to write annual comprehensive report. Review GE outcomes, review institutional outcomes, review trends applicable to allocation of resources. When does the committee see report completed and submitted? By the end of Spring 2012. If it will inform



resource allocation what about end of Fall instead? It would be part of the AUP. Would that be behind since they are looking at previous year's data? The data would be the same as what the departments are seeing when writing their AUP's. Would it be a part of the section plans?

Do you see that plan as informing the conclusion as part of the master plan or a part of the master plan? Suzie believes it should be the conclusion of the master plan. We will have the PLO data from the previous year for most departments. Should it only reflect unit plan discussion or should it include previous information from the spring. Focus is solely on SLO's, themes and trends and tracking where we are. How many SLO's were assessed that year? Single most important is the feedback loop. Where are we capturing the feedback loop? It is captured at several levels. Department discussion which drives future decisions, reported to

We are not asking for specifics anymore. Information is captured haphazardly in different places. Nowhere in our documents are we specifically tracking that information on the assessment and changes, recommendations, etc. Science did a paragraph on each assessment including how many SLO's and if there was a problem or not. If a problem there was a short paragraph indicting the gap identified, and the possible improvement. CurricUNET will be capturing this type of data, but chairs need additional training on how to report out the data.

Comprehensive assessment reports there are a number of them at each level. One large report will be completed by the assessment committee. Where is that formalized? In the AUP, CurricUNET provides fields that collect this data, and there are

How often are we pulling PLO's for how a department is doing? The year the PLO is being assessed it would be included in the PR and then following year in the AUP. If outcome is below target then there would need to be some assessment and should be included in the AUP. The Program Review just completed will help guide the AUP for the following year in assisting the department in determining what, if anything, needs to be addressed specifically.

WASC wants to know the specific tracking of PLO's and SLO's.

Next year we will revise the document we will make sure the PLO's are addressed. The document will be changed to be much more specific in the expectation of information.

Claudia, Julie, Vivian, and Suzie – committee makeup

Where are we in assessing PLO's mostly done the newer programs have not completed theirs yet. Mostly using course level SLO's – no not most some are using capstone classes.

4. Next meetings – Tuesday morning. How often – skip first Tuesday of semester – start on January 24th every other week for 4 meetings and then we will see where we are.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

February 15, 2012

MB 212

MINUTES

Present: Corey Marvin, Tina Tuttle, Claudia Sellers, Suzie Ama, Matthew Crow, Tammy Kinnan

Absent: Heather Ostash, Kim Kelly

This is the first time the committee has met since December. We need to catch up a bit. We can discuss where we are and what do we want to accomplish.

Discuss an assessment mechanism for this years integrated planning. A survey will be completed.

Who, what, when - College community at large and what level of engagement in planning. What is the awareness of IEC's work? It is not fair to assume that there is a general awareness of the IEC committee. The committee versus how decisions are made. The assessment could be sent out separately as targeted assessments as well. Sending it out to the general population may be a good idea. How should we proceed? What do we want to assess needs to be determined? Send your recommendations to Corey via email. Establish a spreadsheet of changes.

One thing that did not work THIS TIME– Annual Unit Plans due on October 31st and too many other items were due immediately following. Should we have AUPs due 10/31? Maybe move timelines to provide a smoother flow.

Corey has invited Gale Lebsock to join this committee. It is important to have the appropriate administrators on this committee. We need to hear from the operations side on how things work and where they should be inserted. The budget is a major piece of the process. We need to go back to the previous budget spreadsheets in the fall while doing AUP's. The budget sheets will be turned in at the October deadline.

What is the role of this committee and program reviews. Currently, Academic Senate has defunct program review committee. The unlikelihood of the senate committee providing objective may be an issue. A committee representing all constituents would be more in line for the first read of PR's and off feedback. The process still needs to be addressed. Corey has been keeping up with the PR's and the timeline is late Feb or early Mar. Put on radar that we will have PR's coming through and will provide feedback. Will CIC review the Program Reviews? In the past CIC has looked at PR's, but as an informational item only. Historically, CIC has reviewed the academic PR's. What did CIC really do with them? Nothing, CIC was not in position to provide feedback. If senate wants to review process and conduct 1st and 2nd readings for the revisions that would be beneficial. Timeline should include submission points along the way. What goes into the program reviews will be very important in the future. As a committee we need to keep an eye on ARC report and other important data such as the White House report that Tina presented. Completions are completions and it does not matter how many



students are out there that have not completed the necessary documents. There are program completers and there are transfer prepared students. We need to have vision. We need to get our feet under us and we have been starting from scratch. We have good programs we have been lacking the institutional framework.

SLO's – Suzie is working on accreditation and needs to know what do we want to say about PR in our evaluation? Do we site the old process and indicate that changes are being made. Put in as old process for now. We will have to take our medicine on this issue. Senate will continue working on revamping the process and the historical process can be included, indicating the changes we have made through IEC's move into the review process. By fall we will not be that much better than we are right now, but we are moving into the right direction. Matt attended training last week on this type of issue and what type of response should be included in the self-study. The answer provided was the college should go on warning, but many argued no. So it depends on who the visiting committee members are.

The college has made good progress in the areas of quality faculty, and quality management. We are making improvements.

Next meeting – February 29, 2012 we will review the accreditation standards that affect us.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

February 29, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I. Minutes and Action Items

- a. 11/15/12, 11/29/12, 2/15/12 Minutes

II. Accreditation Standards Review

- a. I.B (all)
- b. II.A.2.e-I
- c. III.A.6
- d. III.B.2.b
- e. III.C.2
- f. III.D.1.a

III. Evaluation Instruments

- a. We need to determine the evaluation instrument(s) we're going to use for the integrated planning cycle. We talked about this last time and left agreeing to think about it. I suggest two parts. We should assess the Educational Master Plan document itself, which is the key 'deliverable' of the planning cycle. We should come up with a rubric and score it—or score individual parts of it.
- b. We should establish a satisfaction survey that we can send out to all those who were involved. Another survey of some kind might be sent around to gauge how deeply the regular faculty and staff understand this process and what we are doing. (Although I shudder at the results of such a survey, it will provide a nice benchmark for future progress.)

IV. Future Meeting Dates

March 14	April 11
March 28	April 25

V. Adjournment



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

February 29, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

I. Minutes and Action Items

- a. 11/15/12, 11/29/12, 2/15/12 Minutes were approved as submitted.

II. Accreditation Standards Review

- a. I.B (all)
- b. II.A.2.e-l
- c. III.A.6
- d. III.B.2.b
- e. III.C.2
- f. III.D.1.a

Moved to the March 14, 2012 agenda

III. Evaluation Instruments

- a. We need to determine the evaluation instrument(s) we're going to use for the integrated planning cycle. We talked about this last time and left agreeing to think about it. I suggest two parts. We should assess the Educational Master Plan document itself, which is the key 'deliverable' of the planning cycle. We should come up with a rubric and score it—or score individual parts of it.
- b. We should establish a satisfaction survey that we can send out to all those who were involved. Another survey of some kind might be sent around to gauge how deeply the regular faculty and staff understand this process and what we are doing. (Although I shudder at the results of such a survey, it will provide a nice benchmark for future progress.)

IV. Future Meeting Dates

March 14	April 11
March 28	April 25

V. Adjournment

April 2, 2012

IEC Meeting

Program Review

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Claudia Sellers, Tina Tuttle, Heather Ostash, Kim Kelly-Schwartz, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent: Gale Lebsock, Suzie Ama, and Matthew Crow

What is the role of the IEC with the program review? Is it our job to stop them or is our job to say these are in need of improvement. We would like Academic Senate to weigh in on this and what they perceive what happens. These will not go through CIC. We need a training session on how to do program review correctly. Next year there are no program reviews due. We will fit in general education and basic skills program reviews. We can hold out Child Development and Library as good examples. One thing that should be conveyed is this should be written as the support for the continuation of the program. They need to justify the existence of the program.

Questions – How do you back up a claim and how do you present evidence.

The scatter shot approach of fire, welding, and paralegal was evident. Two most important things in paralegals are serving outside our area, and the internship – which was never mentioned. The paralegal program internship was not addressed. The program will not be successful without the capstone class, and without the internship the students cannot graduate. They also recommend stacking classes which is not a good idea. Stacking classes does not work, especially at the entry level. We are extremely thin ice when we are combining classes to meet the minimum hours required.

For next year's cycle we are hoping to have a timeline in place so first draft will be due Dec 1st. This will provide time for feedback and then final due date February or March. Data will be provided sooner, as it was not provided until November of this cycle. There have been several mitigating circumstances this time. Being proactive is a good idea. Providing a section of well written program review will be helpful, along with a copy of a poor program review. This committee bears some responsibility of the expectations, clear documentation, and training. Next year we will work on general education and basic skills. Training is definitely on the horizon.

There were a couple of recommendations regarding the formatting of the document. We need to embed page numbers.. Tina considered PDFing the data so the tables could be copied and pasted into the document, but this does not work as planned. We need a standard set of tables that everyone looks at. Tina sets the tables to print on one page when she provided the file. We need to be careful and find a way to address the onesy, twosy for ethnicity. We will continue to refine the process and get better with time. This will be the opportunity to make the template better.

General question – do we look at productivity in terms of fulltime productivity? Looking at productivity in terms of evaluation do we look at fulltime versus adjunct seems to be missing. Nan’s brainstorming is cost versus FTEF.

Training topic-insertion of tables into document.

Child Development - Acceptable

Completeness – Outstanding

Strength and Analysis - Outstanding Boarder line between acceptable and weak in strength and analysis – it seemed to be missing review or not very robust review of the data (with standardized tables it would be easier to review).

Student Achievement - Weak in evidence Acceptable and close to weak

Overall impression – Acceptable Outstanding

This one displayed a thorough knowledge of the students and their enrollment patterns which was very well argued in many areas. Program has high productivity in comparison. The program review talked about increases in average section size, FTES, and productivity. A benefit of completing a previous program review is the ability to go back and look at where they were and where they are now. Contains lots of meaningful comments. Identified individuals on different campuses and their role in driving the number. Better understanding of the drivers of what’s occurring in the program. Really strong sense of program. Only at point of drilling down to the statistics of student achievement and how to influence that may be a little weaker. Clearly know their program and make decisions based on input. Evaluating and acting on that evaluation. Only thing that did not come out was the student achievement issue. The program review did acknowledge that they did attempt but failed and are in the process of reworking. The program review was self-critical which was impressive.

Two comments – 1) Core courses and electives have been kept to the necessary minimum so that a child development program does not dilute the creation of cohorts. 2) The action plans need to identify specific persons not a general committee. Somebody is responsible for getting the stuff done. A specific person must be named.

Classroom space in the CDC not currently used was also a disconnect and not sure where that came from.

The safety of the facility is the responsibility of the CDC not the child development program and will be addressed in the CDC program review.

The request to hire fulltime faculty is based on equability. Courses would not be added, but the fulltime faculty member would take the place of some adjunct. This program now has three fulltime faculty members.

FIRE Technology –Weak

Completeness – Weak Acceptable

Strength and Analysis - Weak Acceptable

Student Achievement - Weak Acceptable

Overall impression – Weak Acceptable

Not on right form missing some information. Not addressed was who is taking these classes. There is an utter mismatch between students in the analysis (volunteer fire fighters) and the programs and descriptions which is Advanced Studies in Fire Service. One point in the document there is justification for volunteer fighter fighters. Are volunteer fire fighters going to take a 33 unit degree/certificate? The program review does not articulate who its students are. How are local fire agencies currently addressing their needs? Why is this program needed, especially at 33 units with 16 separate elective courses? Who are the students taking courses and why would there be more students taking courses than there currently are. The assumption is if we go online and we start offering more of these courses because we only offer two on site, then we will have more students – when and why, no justification. Mentioned that BC and AVC have similar programs but they will not affect our program. Yearly employer survey mentioned but not attached. SLO section talks about police academy. Maybe we need to consider a fire academy but maybe consider eliminating degree and certificate. But that entire conversation is missing. Program has lecture/labs. What is involved in the labs: space, equipment, etc. Program matrix every course satisfies every PLO, if that is the case then why do you need 33 units, you will only need the bare minimum of 18. This was a very check the box approach. Little real evaluation and where there is evaluation it does not tie into or is completely and totally unsubstantiated. Changes are being made or there things being done, but there is no indication based on specific evidence or what type of evaluation. If evaluation is being done none of that was provided. What is it, how is it conducted, and what information are they getting back. Student survey mentioned but no evidence to support. There were places where the police academy was included. Police has academies that teach people to be police officers, and then there is the transfer course for AJ. Police academy was included in this PR and should not be.

Library – Outstanding

Completeness – Outstanding

Strength and Analysis - Outstanding

Student Achievement – Outstanding

Overall impression – Outstanding

The program review included what has is currently happening in the LRC and what the previous librarian did. You can learn something from a program review.

Clearly understands the market, drivers driving behaviors, due diligence, critical, makes sharp business decisions. Data base choices, reference services, and what we are no longer using.

Program review included evidence in places where you would expect to see the evidence. Has a clear understanding. In library program review if you are doing it right and have the right evidence it is not complicated, it is very straightforward. A program review becomes complicated when it is not done right – that is not the case with the library program review. This program review is logical, straightforward, linear, and provides good information and documentation. You can learn something from program review. She has been doing the right things and is now providing the program review to substantiate this. She knows where she wants to improve her program, she goes and gets the data to back that up, and then improves the program. This was a clear and fresh program review.

Many program reviews do not understand the context of their programs, market place, and where they program should be going. They are like mini environmental scans.

Paralegal – Weak

Completeness – Acceptable/Weak

Strength and Analysis - Weak

Student Achievement – Weak

Overall impression – Weak

This program review retained the prompting language-why. These are professional documents, and should not include prompting language. If Para 101 is the gateway to the rest of program why is it not required as pre-requisites to all other courses. How do you have a gateway class that is not required before all other classes? Program matrix is missing the elective courses itemized out. There is completely different set of outcomes in the mission section, and cut and paste in several places. Program employer's headquarters are out of the state. Should include local information on law offices and paralegals? Continuing education for paralegals is a niche market. The program has three completers which equates to a zero percent completion rate. , nothing in service area, and now laying plans for increasing the program through contract education – did not include how, why, and who. There was no evidence to support claim on growing program. Internship not addressed. No evidence of knowledge of students, who are they, why taking courses, no relationship to effectiveness of courses. Changes need to be made to be consistent with career pathways. This is a faculty centric approach. Graduates who are now employed? Internships completely not addressed in the patterns of course offerings. Third bullet of improvements needed – not discussed in the document. No evidence of knowledge of the students, who are they, why taking courses, no relationship to the effectiveness. There was a survey mentions but no documentation of a student survey included. Frist two bullets changes need to be made to be consistent with pathways. Pre-reqs. do not indicate program health, but large class size. Have any of the graduates actually gotten jobs – this question was not addressed. Why so few not just completers not just students in the internship class who could complete, that information is missing. Having only 4 students every two years in the internship class – is this

acceptable? Overall the program is missing critical analysis and the repetition is distracting. There are concerns with the number of awards for this program. Program review is very weak. What is the restriction of the programs that service outside of our service area? We need to reach an economy of scale to make this work. Scale program back and provide professional management, and try to continue serving outside our service area to keep program going. What drives our students to become Cerro Coso students, what influences them to take the courses they do? Serving students outside our service area does not indicate program deactivation, but what do we need to do to make this an effective program. What do we need to do to get students involved in this program? Who are the students and what the employment needs are.

The personal interest is pivotal in getting the students involved and retaining the enrollment. What do we need to do to get students here and keep them here? Counseling should not be the only personal contact. In the unit plan there are questions regarding community connection and partnerships which are not included in PR. Understanding the drivers will be critical in the coming years.

Program reviews are not written to address the longevity of the program.

Condition of enrollment not adequately addressed – classroom performance. Where is the evidence that there is undocumented labor force demand on the base for additional aerospace personnel? Assumptions are being made. Speculation becomes fact and a common course of conversation. Student demand section is not addressed – marketing to new students of contract ed students. No discussion of FTES, only a proposal to create more. Course linkage discussion is good but . . . Many areas where things were intentionally passed over. Teaching methods – what issue was it and why was it not addressed. Include information on how many local law firms, paralegals how many, how long has program been in existence (multiple years included). Program has been picking up steam – number of completers. Gainful employment information would be helpful and should be included. Committee was not clear which program was being discussed. Certificate or AA. Costs for textbooks were skewed. Kudos for including textbooks, but the numbers do no match. We need to be clear on the difference between direct and indirect costs and what those two include; this information can be provided by the IR. Is it required and important to include non-resident versus resident students. Advisory committee was made up of family members, and made up of mostly employees of the college. Six year plan is missing.

Tweak – include partnerships and community connections. How do we broaden the functionality of recruitment and outreach? Perhaps have it be a joint effort between student services and instructional faculty.

Paralegal advisory committee is made up of mostly of people who teach for us. According the environmental scan the committee is related (family members). Which is the absolute opposite of the intent of the advisory committee.

The program reviews should not be written as a “check the box”, but should be responding to the market place needs.

Welding - Weak

Completeness – Weak

Strength and Analysis - Weak

Student Achievement – Weak

Overall impression – Weak

There are three programs degree and certificate which for the most part are the same thing. Welding has an additional certificate and this document does not separate that. Document was not complete and did not contain a serious tone. The document and kept prompting questions and template language, which should have been removed. Phrasing did not make sense. Scheduling is such that students can take second level at the same time as other courses. What does second level mean? Moving to a cohort model recommended why and what is driving this move? Material fees remain the same, even though costs have increased. This provides glimpse of a lack of planning. Employer relationship is very thin and needs to be vastly expanded. Still not sure what the program relationship is and where – in our service are, in town? Certain employers send employees to us for training, but no real number to substantiate the information. No analysis of advisory committee, just a list of names. Statements of course increases with another instructor were not substantiated. The evidence is backwards. The students are passing classes so they must be achieving the SLO's. The beginning classes fill quickly, but that is not the case with all classes. Once non-payment drops were completed the classes did not fill again. There were not 25 in the class, and 25 on wait list. Has the advisory committee spoken to the base to determine the current and future need? Something needs to be done to help determine the community needs. There is discussion of surveys but the support is not included. The need for surveys is important and we need to survey alums to obtain critical component that we need to determine if this was useful. There is no evidence of student employment after graduation, or that they are satisfactorily prepared if they do get work. That is because there are no SLO's. This entire program review comes down to opening a class that fills and all is good. The program review is simply a “check the box” process and completely unnecessary. There not goals. There is a sense of complacency feeling of protection. The value of this process is not seen, because they do not see how there will be any value added.

Almost all PR's mention employment gaps, and the chairs hold no responsibility to gather information on employability. They have the most direct interaction with students. The faculty could gain valuable information from the students during the course of the semester.

Putting the pressure on to get completers solves every problem as will Degree Works. You will naturally design program to obtain the maximum number of completers. If resources start to go away because there are no completers the faculty will begin to get a clue. They have the sense of protection. There are no true consequences for poor performing programs.

Personal remarks – apology to Tina for passing along negative remarks without removing them. Original forwarding of document – Corey originally intended to remove the personal statements. The lack of professionalism is seen throughout the document. The program reviews should be professional and should not include personal bias. The program review can contain personality as long as it is professional as long as it does the job it is supposed to do. That is to make a case for the continuation of the program. Slang and poor grammar is considered inappropriate in this document and highly unprofessional.

Currently we have major ODS issues and the district has not seen this as a priority. General student tables are still not loaded and last week Tina noticed the declining headcounts from 2008 forward. The IR's are not able to nail the issue down and have continued to raise this issue. There are issues that continue to come up, but the communication piece is critical. Data integrity is an uphill climb. The issue was the numbers do not add up, and there was no real rhyme or reason.

Feedback will be provided to the faculty chairs. This group's purpose is not to be a barrier or gate that blocks progress with the program reviews. The feedback would be communicated as the document moves along. So each step receives the feedback provided.

Are we going to take a prescriptive approach to the quality of the program review? Talking about right of assignment and faculty chair evaluations which fall under the purview of the office of Academic Affairs. The program reviews are a recommendation. Accountability is important for this process. In order to hold everyone accountable the top must be clean on their end. Previous program reviews was simply to have a complete document. They were not read in the past. This is a completely local process. Side by side is a shift in expectation and a shift in resources. The outcome of this process for a poor program review is that courses are not offered. This group's role will to review process and see the gaps in training, resources, and materials provided to ensure that the process will be successful. But if something completely misses the mark and unprofessional there are steps to make necessary improvements.

The professional development committee just finished its plan and it is pretty comprehensive. It states that next year there will be trainings on things that we have not done well. Flex day explanation on integrated planning cycle, embedded evaluations, etc. Where are the faculty members that do not attend faculty chairs, get their information? We will continue to provide training for all.

Machine Tools Program Review must be completed by next semester.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

July 30, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**
 - a. Minutes**
- II. College Report Card**
- III. Annual Unit Plans**
 - a. Scoring last year's annual unit plans**
 - b. Identifying changes for the 2012 – 2013 planning cycle (ex. Budget section)**
- IV. Reviewing the Comprehensive Assessment Report**
- V. Work flow for Program Discontinuance**
- VI. Meeting Schedule for 2012 - 2013**
- VII. Adjournment**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

July 30, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Heather Ostash, Gale Lebsock, Jill Board, Matt Crow, Claudia Sellers, Kim Kelly-Schwartz, Suzie Ama, Tina Tuttle, and Tammy Kinnan

I. Minutes and Action Items

a. Minutes

II. College Report Card

Corey does not see that this needs to be a large document. Can be presented in pie charts, back to front in visual what we have achieved. Include a section for conclusions and closing the loop. Some sort of analysis.

Institutional Assessment Report Card

SLO's – say where we are – we already have this information in chart format

Annual unit planning process – percentage done, those done/not done will include all of the plans

Program Reviews – planned vs. completed, scores – data done

Currency on COR's

Conclusion analysis / closing the loop

Goals

When does this committee want to see final version to approve. This document is a piece of the accreditation document by August 10th. How about next Monday. As a group it would be nice to finalize a tool to use for next year.

Program review and student achievement data should be the driving force for all plans.

The information should feed up from the other plans and help form the second level plans. The second level plans will have access to the data for the next round. We will continue to refine the process to be inclusive of all needed data. The lines will be clearer during the next round, and will continue to be more clearly defined. We should not make decisions that help improve student learning.

Planning will take place and the second level plans are to be an examination and scrutiny of the AUP's.



List of AUP's, second level plans, and others was presented to college council. Corey will pull plan and provide a copy to Gale.

Maybe pull all areas that have a budget, slot in somewhere so it has a place at the table. Anything that has to do with facilities, IT, PIO, etc. could be labeled as such in each plan. Another possibility is to have every area complete an AUP. Then a second plan could be completed by the different areas to include all facilities, IT, PIO, etc. requests. The AUP's are due on October 15th. Question is – do we have every area complete a AUP? It seems silly to have some areas complete an AUP. We want to capture each area with a budget. Every item that has a budget should do an AUP but some will roll up (switchboard, print shop. Each area must be captured in one of these – Annual Unit Plan, Annual Section Plans, Annual Division Plans, to the Resource Support Plan (second level plan) will identify trends, commonalities, etc.

Action Item – Gale will bring complete list of all budgets for each entity.

TIMELINE

RRP/Second level – due 2/1

ADP – due 11/15

ASP – due 11/1

AUP – due 10/15

The budget development committee will have approximately one month to review the requests prior to the budget proposal deadline in December.

Let's do half steps into the budget changes. We will go with what we have done in the past with general fund worksheets and then in the spring we can review at the time. We are capturing some information that we have not captured in prior years. Priority connection to the strategic planning goals, and justification.

We will use the previous budget worksheets to collect the budget piece through the annual unit planning process. To determine the need for facilities, IT, PIO, etc. add an additional column for a checkmark.

III. Annual Unit Plans

a. Scoring last year's annual unit plans

Do we want to use a rubric to score the plans?

b. Identifying changes for the 2012 – 2013 planning cycle (ex. Budget section)

IV. Reviewing the Comprehensive Assessment Report



Currently in draft form. Suzie reviewed the front matter and methodology. She would like help with the results and themes section. This group will review the ILO's. Health and Wellness has not been assessed and was not in CurricUNET.

ILO's biggest spread is using technology. Jill would like to see the questions that were asked and in what context.

Corey would like to see this information prompt conversations in many areas and committees around the campus. This should be provided as a part of the data for the AUP's. This should stop short of making goals for the next year. CCESE made up the cohort which is other like institutions.

GELO's are pretty straightforward. Suzie made a few recommendations that are in the area of natural sciences and humanities. The general ed program review should bring out these types of questions. What courses are necessary, but not necessarily needed and relevant? Humanities also have a few places that need realignment. No goals section necessary.

Suzie is to be commended for producing a quality document.

V. Work flow for Program Discontinuance

The senate would like to make this committee be the group that makes recommendation to senate for programs discontinuance. This is a pretty big change and a lot of work. However, the conversation was that they want an objective group to look at the programs and use the criteria to make the determination for program discontinuance. The list will be public on August 16th. College action is to be complete by Friday, October 16th. This will not allow a semester. We will have the month of September and part of October to review, discuss, and look at data. The senate will have discussions with the affected groups. The program discontinuance process must be complete and the document must be in the President's hand no later than October 15th. There are two readings required by the senate. The senate will need to consider a special meeting to accommodate the timeline. The rational is the initiator and board policy allows the initiator to be an educational administrator. August 16th will be the presentation for the rational for the program discontinuance. The list will be made public and the committee will have until October 1st to complete the process. The IEC is responsible for the written report. Will IEC remain as the committee that will serve as the program discontinuance committee?

Suzie asked what the criteria used in the determination of which program(s) would be considered for program discontinuance.

Corey does not see that IEC as an effective committee for this process.

We are currently operating under the old version of the guidelines.



Why don't we use the program review template to determine program discontinuance?
It is because no one will provide the data to eliminate their program.

VI. Meeting Schedule for 2012 – 2013

Next meeting - August 13th in the afternoon 2:00 – 4:00.

Regular meeting schedule – 1st and 3rd Monday from 2:00 – 4:00.

August 13 – 2:00 – 4:00

August 27 – 2:00 – 4:00

Then to the first and third through the February 2013

VII. Future agenda items

Next meeting bring a complete list of all area budgets and we will place each one in 1 of the 3 areas (AUP, ASP, ADP)

VIII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

August 13, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Minutes and Action Items**
 - a. Minutes – July 30, 2012**
- II. College Report Card**
- III. Annual Unit Plan Template**
- IV. Program Discontinuance**
- V. Adjournment**



Institutional Effectiveness Committee

August 13, 2012

MB 212

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Suzie Ama, Heather Ostash, Jill Board, Gale Lebsock, Matt Crow, Claudia Sellers, and Tammy Kinnan – scribe.

Absent: Kim Kelly-Schwartz and Tina Tuttle.

I. Minutes and Action Items

- a. **Minutes – July 30, 2012** –approved with recommended changes – remove “not” from sentence regarding improving student success.

II. College Report Card

Missing course outlines of record. Seemed to fall quite naturally into the three areas we are working on. COR's and how current we are. Brief intro and conclusion piece for each area seemed to flow. In accreditation document we have 44 programs with defined SLO's in 2012-13 catalog but we have 42 with the removal of fire technology. If there are no future additions, with the exception of adding the COR's, Corey will makes the changes and move forward with finalizing the document.

III. Annual Unit Plan Template

Based on previous conversations we talked about the budget worksheet and how it will work with AUP template. The AUP template will provide justification and the budget sheets will provide the dollar amount. Only a few changes were made the to AUP template. 3.8.A is data needed when requesting a new faculty member. This is the criteria recommended by the working group and the chancellor. Classified staff requests is just one way in which classified support is requested. Jill would like to see the two processes used across the campus become connected. These staffing requests at the unit level will filter up through the AUP process. It is incumbent upon the administrator to question the request.

Action Item: Matt will verify the questions in 3.A.



The 4000's section has been adjusted per the request of the Director of Administrative Services to provide quality information. Also check boxes were included for ease of use.

Should we create a priority rubric? This would help with the understanding of the appropriateness of their requests. We need to let everyone know that if everything is ranked a one (1), then everything is negated.

We have talked about the need to rate or score the planning documents. We did not complete that task last year. If we were to score the AUP document from last year it would be a lower score.

The expectation is that the template will be used and the connection with the budget request sheet will be made.

The AUP would be for IT operations. The next level will be used by the budget committee to evaluate requests. If there is too much filter there will potentially be some backlash.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding the staff development placement. Where does this information come from and who is responsible for providing the information and where. Does this group complete an AUP or where do they fit in.

Any changes to the template? The group is okay with the template as it is. The roll out will be tomorrow at the faculty chair meeting. The roll out to non-instructional areas will be consistent and all involved will receive detailed instructions. There will be a training piece during the faculty chair meeting tomorrow. There will also be training for the administration during the August 27th meeting.

Action Item – Corey will provide AUP, ASP, and ADP information and training for administration on August 27th.

The AUP's due date is October 15th.

How does the SLO report from Suzie get aggregated into the ILO's? This information would be provided to the units to use in their AUP's. There should be a discussion at a top level which would include the findings.

Is the report card a reporting out or is it an analysis? Where do the ILO findings get reported out? One giant step back – what do we use the ILO's for? Some schools use the ILO's as a focus for the direction of the college. Currently, the ILO's are there and we



need to determine their use. We need to have the larger conversation as to why we should have the ILO's.

IV. Program Discontinuance

The conversation has taken place over the summer. As you are aware we have been charged with Program discontinuance because we are in a budget crisis. The VP's discussed general criteria for all three colleges. The decisions will be made based on the same criteria.

1. Completers
2. Average Enrollment
3. Productivity
- 4.
5. Cost

In an effort to identify the first scrutiny the line of nine and ten was drawn. Double digit completers were the number. Bakersfield was drawing the line at 48. The list from BC was very long. They are keeping a limited number of programs at the top. Based on the criteria the list provided was drawn up. All data was based on three years. The dollar amount is actual costs pulled from previous load sheets. This did include the benefits. The average labor cost is \$620,537. But the revenue reduction will create an issue in the 2013-14 fiscal year.

Officially the following programs will be recommended for program discontinuance: Small Business/Entrepreneurship, Fire Technology, Machine Tool, and Paralegal. We must continue to get more productive as a college overall. All other programs have very low completers. The recommendation is that these programs cannot continue in the fashion they have been. They will have one year probationary period to get on solid footing and show at least 10 completers. Our expectation should be that the completers are there every year. There are factors that are out of the hands of those that teach the classes. Matriculation, course offerings, and student drive are all factors low completion rates. There are repercussions for years when we

The lack of liberal arts programs on the list is because if we cut the math program we still need to offer the math classes. So it would not do any good to cut the math program. Most of the liberal arts classes are general ed requirements. We have cut many sections in the general ed classes. On the liberal arts and sciences side of the house we are cutting sections, but not cutting programs. We are eliminating options rather than programs.

The programs that remain on the list have one year probationary period to make dramatic improvement. If there is no improvement the program will go on the program



discontinuance list. The programs are on the list for a variety of reasons. We cannot be all things to all people. The programs need to streamline and become more efficient.

In general, Corey would like IEC to provide input and guidance into the processes we use at the college. The IEC should have a process akin to a mode C for the programs. We need to provide some oversight. We need a formalized process.

How many years do we give a new program to establish itself. Three years is the standard timeline.

None of this should come as a surprise to the faculty.

The missing piece, that we are not in a position to use, is the job placement information. Ultimately this is not just completers, but we need to include the working/employment piece. Corey has asked Valerie to make this piece a priority for this year.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.