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 owe 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.

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 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 – The 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.