



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.