



Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
 October 21, 2013  
 MB 212  
 1:00

Present: Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Laura Vasquez, Vivian Baker, Gale Lebsock, Bill Locke, Heather Ostash, Michael Carley, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent:

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. <b>Call to order</b>	C. Marvin	1:04 p.m.		
2. <b>Approval of</b> Minutes & Action Items From September 30, 2013	C. Marvin	<p>Action items: From September 30, 2013</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a first draft of our version of the Thunion report to the IEC group. (4) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b> On today’s agenda.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of Mira Costa recommendation on department pages for the group to review. Share the Mira Costa website location for this. (5) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 21, 2013.</b> Completed. Every unit that does a unit plan should have a page. Would make planning information more transparent.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Chairs and College Council on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Corey Marvin. Completion Date – Faculty Chair - October 14, 2013 and College Council - October 17, 2013.</b> The response from the faculty chairs was tepid at best, but they understand the logic. The Academic Senate response was also tepid.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Report to Faculty Senate on the recommendation of IEC is to reduce the Program Review Cycle from 6 years to 5 years. (6) Responsible person – Laura Vasquez. Completion Date – October 17, 2013.</b> Complete</p> <p><b>Action Item – Provide a copy of the ILO’s and current assessment for the IEC group.</b></p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p><b>(7) Responsible person – Tammy Kinnan. Completion Date – Thursday, October 3, 2013.</b> Complete</p> <p>Minutes from September 30, 2013 – approved as submitted</p>		
<b>3. Approval of Agenda</b>	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
<b>4. Faculty Hiring Rubric</b>	C. Marvin	<p>This has been popularity contest in the past. Last spring ad-hoc committee worked on new process. Rather than whole senate voting exec council works with VPs and scores based on rubric and that information goes forward to the president. Rubric on front and back has information that faculty chairs are asked to respond to in AUP. Data was supplied in trend sheets at the beginning of the year. The chairs respond to the questions 1 – 7 in the AUP using the data provided and they do not just list the numbers. They analyze the data, and make decisions based on the information/data provided. The smaller colleges have disciplines that have one person departments and the vacancy can create a loss of a department. The rubric consists of data points that compare with the data points in the AUP. The comparison is with other disciplines, not departments. We hire in disciplines not departments. This rubric fits the instructional faculty. How do we handle the library and counseling? We need to create a rubric that fits these areas, which may require two very different rubrics.</p> <p>Addition - Other conditions – something that may influence the need for a new hire- outside influences.</p> <p>What if we also had a brief qualitative rubric in addition to the rubric provided?</p> <p>This is a good start, and needs a Beta test. The Chancellor needs the list of possible positions by November 4<sup>th</sup>. The chairs would like the opportunity to meet with the committee rather than rewriting their AUP's to address the new rubric. The meeting needs to be next week and the revised version should be in the hands of the faculty chairs right away. Next year they will receive the formal version and meetings will not be required.</p> <p>We need something similar that is relevant to the counseling and library.</p>		X
<b>5. Institution-set Standards</b>	C. Marvin	The College needs to come up with institution set standards for course completion, student retention, student degree completion, and transfer to 4-year colleges/university. Where is the appropriate place for this conversation? This was discussed at the last faculty chair meeting. Most colleges just provided a rolling		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>average. The idea is to begin meaningful dialogue about the standards per ACCJC. Do we have different standards for on-site and on-line or are they combined? This should go to the district VP meetings and determine if it will be done as we always have-average. The student success and support council should also be included.</p> <p><b>Action Item – Take the institution-set standards to student success and support council meeting for discussion. Responsible person – Heather Ostash and Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 30, 2013.</b></p>		
6. <b>Thoyote Draft</b>	C. Marvin	<p>The handout was reviewed in detail. Goal 1 – missing student services data points. We are keeping the current strategic plan, and working on the data points that will work with what we have, and we are also collecting data points that will enhance our next strategic planning steps. We should not be too specific as the goals may change. There are some data points that are enduring and track-able.</p> <p>Climate survey, college in review, and score card are available for additional information.</p>		X
7. <b>Review of Action Items</b>	C. Marvin	<p><b>Action Item – Take the institution-set standards to student success and support council meeting for discussion. Responsible person – Heather Ostash and Corey Marvin. Completion Date – October 30, 2013.</b></p>		
8. <b>Future Agenda Items</b>		None		
9. <b>Future Meeting Dates</b> August 19, 2013 September 30, 2013 October 21, 2013 November 4 18, 2013 DATE CHANGE January 13, 2014 February 3, 2014 March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
10. <b>Adjourn</b>		3:05 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/C Closed