Institutional Effectiveness Committee
March 25, 2013
MB 212 & CCC Confer
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

MINUTES – APPROVED

Attendees: Corey Marvin, Gale Lebsock, Heather Ostash, Suzie Ama, Michael Carley – PC, Matthew Crow, Claudia Sellers, and Tammy Kinnan – scribe.

Absent: Kim Kelly-Schwartz and Jill Board

I. **Minutes and Action Items – February 25, 2013** – approved as submitted

II. **Action Items**

    a. Develop Self-evaluation for IEC and College Council – for IEC we have reached proficiency if all boxes have a checkmark. Program Review, SLO, and IEC will be responsible for their specific piece of the college proficiency.

<div align="center">

(VPAA – chair)

IEC – institutional planning

learning outcomes – SLO   PR – program review (still in progress)

(elected member)   (co-chairs instructional & non-instructional)

</div>

This will move forward to college council for discussion and possibly approval. Do we formalize the process with one chair per committee, co-chairs, or another option? Having a co-chair for the program review was recommended.

Action Item – Corey will take the proposal above to the next College Council meeting.

Institutional Communication Rubric – the committee reviewed and discussed the first draft and there were additions and changes recommended.

The college mission, strategic goals, and vision need to be included on a separate piece of the rubric. They serve as the guardians of the mission, vision, and strategic goals.

Action Item – Corey will revise the rubric with the recommendations from the committee. Completion time April 8, 2013.

b. Accreditation Steering Committee Composition – faculty co-chairs for each standard was recommended. College Council was in support of the change and we can break up the standards which will consist of a manager and appropriate faculty member. These groups will be responsible for tracking progress on the standard without waiting until the report is due.

Action Item – Tammy will revise the document for approval at the April 8th meeting.

III. **Art Program Review – Mostly acceptable with evidence of student achievement as weak**

Is it relevant, current, know where it is going, have a trajectory, sustainable, and viable. The majority of the PR was based on the closure of the facility for two years. ESCC was mentioned without any plan for the future. The ESCC question was never fully engaged. The PR is missing key component about its intentions, where it is and where it is going. Explain the reason to go to the TMC and why did the department decide to go that direction. Re-visit the SLO assessment to the 3 and 6 year goals. A bullet point looks ahead to the 6 year goals. Looking at the department historically they were able to grow their own degree achievers, but with the changes in repeatability have dramatically reduced the enrollment opportunities for long time students. In addition, the removal of stacked classes has reduced enrollment options. There were also questions regarding the data charts provided.

a. Addressing ESCC in order to provide context of Annual Unit Plan for the future.
b. Lacking a very clear vision of Studio Arts for transfer.
c. Re-visit the SLO assessments to the 3 and 6 year goals – a bullet point which looks ahead to the 6 year goal.

The Program Reviews should be road map for the next 6 years. Program Reviews cover the program, where the AUP's cover the departments. This program review will be returned to the program with the requested updates and returned to IEC for a second review.

IV. **Computer Science – Weak**

Right now we have Computer Science and CIS. Computer Science is a transfer degree, and CIS is a CTE program. When Computer Science moves into the TMC there will be classes that will need to be run each semester that cannot be share with another program. We have only one Computer Science completer since we have been keeping

data. This issue was not satisfactorily addressed in the PR. No solid grasp between the Computer Science and CIS. There is not clear understanding of the intersection between engineering, math, and computer science. CIS is nowhere near the computer science degree. Conditions of enrollment need to be verified. The program review was by a first year faculty member and we need to provide training. This program review will be returned to the program with the requested updates and returned to IEC for a second review.

V.   Strategic Planning Assessment Chart

Handout provided which is a summary of the previous discussions on assessing the strategic goals of the college.

Action Item – Corey will add one additional column providing measurements and who is responsible for actually making progress. April 8, 2013

VI.   Institution-set Standards Required by ACCJC – handout

This report is due on Sunday. This version is more precise and accurate than it has been in the past. District office IR has been very helpful in pulling the data required to complete the report. 14b, 15b, 16b, and 17b are all new additions to the form. We now have to have institution-set standards for student course completion rates, student retention, degree completion, student transfer to 4-year college/university. Which group should work on this? Academic Senate? Academic Senate Executive Council? Faculty Chairs? All Faculty? The group determined that faculty chairs would be the appropriate group. Chairs should be talking to their departments. The ACCCJC has indicated that the institution-set standards should be within reason. The college president's will be talking about this at their meeting with the chancellor tomorrow.

VII.   Future Meeting Dates
~~February 11, 2013~~	April 8, 2013
~~February 25, 2013~~	April 22, 2013
~~March 25, 2013~~	May 6, 2013

VIII.   Adjourned – 3:05 p.m.