



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