



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 November 4, 2013
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Laura Vasquez, Vivian Baker, Bill Locke, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent: Heather Ostash, Gale Lebsock, and Michael Carley

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1:00 p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From October 21, 2013	C. Marvin	<p>Action items: From October 21, 2013</p> <p><i>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. This will be placed on the next agenda for Student Success and Support Council meeting. The past meeting was focused on the Thoyote data points.</i></p> <p>Faculty Hiring Rubric Follow-up - Rubric did not work when tested. There are so many variables to the ratios, where are the students, are there adjuncts available or not, there are multiple various. After deconstructing the rubric it came down to what programs are being offered, which programs are core and which are not, service areas, and various other issues. The executive council will meet with the VPAA and VPSS over the next few weeks to work on the new rubric and generate more informative responses. How do we determine the balance that we need as a college community? We have a broad array of requests. The Executive Council and VPAA for all new faculty requests tomorrow.</p> <p>This should drive a conversation at the district VP level.</p> <p>Minutes from October 21, 2013 – approved as submitted</p>		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Accreditation Visit & Tasks	C. Marvin	Team visited on Monday, here until 2:00 p.m. They were here asking some perfunctory		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
Ahead		<p>questions and the report was very complete. The exit interview was very short. Later on Tuesday there was a concern communicated to the Chancellor that we do not have evaluation process in place for our annual integrated planning process. They are concerned we have not closed the loop on the evaluation process. We have college report card, college council self-evaluation, climate survey, but maybe we didn't fully explain the process. We made one statement and we were too revealing and stated we were not 100% there yet. We have this as our goals for this year. This is IEC's task for the remainder of the year. Part of the issue is the representational committee is not in place for the SLO's.</p> <p>Assessment for IEC, SLO, PLO, and Budget Development are the focus the year.</p>		
5. Cerro Coso College SLO Report	C. Marvin	<p>Numerical Responses from ACCJC SLO Implementation</p> <p>Courses – number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Average score – 3.66 Cerro Coso College score – 3</p> <p>Programs – number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Average score – 3.49 Cerro Coso College score – 1</p> <p>Student Learning and Support Activities – number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Average score – 4.14 Cerro Coso College score – 5</p> <p>Institutional Learning Outcomes – Institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment. Average score – 4.07 Cerro Coso College score – 5</p> <p>Overall average score = 3.44</p> <p>Cerro Coso College overall average score – 3.58</p> <p>Does SLO, Program Review, and IWC do self-evaluation? Or does IEC conduct the evaluation of those committees or do we do both (self-evaluation and IEC evaluation).</p> <p>Rubric – do we create the rubric and hand down or allow the committee to establish their own? Provide the rubric and how will you provide information to support?</p> <p>Program Review Committee make up - five faculty, two administrators, one classified, or four faculty, two administrators, two classified staff. Looking at the original task</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>force and see how was set up. Look at the original makeup. The current SLO committee is working well, so continue with the current faculty and add two administrators, and two classified staff members.</p> <p>Program Review – Corey will serve as the administrator, Laura will find faculty representation at the next Academic Senate meeting.</p> <p>Time line is February so we have measurements determined so that we have something to show for the next year.</p> <p>The annual report is due at the end of March, which incorporates some of the questions included in the feedback report shared today.</p> <p>SLO & Program Review Committees need to be ready to go in January 2014.</p>		
6. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin			
7. Future Agenda Items		None		
8. Future Meeting Dates 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				
9. Adjourn		2:03 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed