



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 February 3, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

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

Absent:

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1:00 p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From November 4, 2013	C. Marvin	Action items: From November 4, 2013 Action Item –None Minutes from November 4, 2013 – approved with changes – The program review committee has not been finalized yet, it is still in progress.		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. 2013 Comprehensive Assessment Report	C. Marvin	Committed to have annual assessment per ACCJC. This is a wrap up of the previous year. Assessments are finalized in October and the report is finalized in December each year and provides a snapshot of where we are when assessment is written. We need red list similar to that of CIC with deadlines. This would help identify courses due for update and identify when department is not meeting deadlines or requirements. The committee has never not approved the assessment, but will be moving in that direction. The committee will make recommendations for improvement. The departments cannot ‘plan to plan’ any longer. They will be required to be much more specific. Creating a cycle for assessment the year prior program review being written was proposed at the faculty chair meeting and met with a bit of resistance by some. What happens when the department does not complete the work necessary to complete the SLO assessments? It should be treated the same as it is in CIC. In the areas where we do not have a full-time person would we recommend providing release time for a part-time faculty member to complete this task? We only have a		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C																				
		<p>couple of disciplines – Philosophy, Paralegal, and ASL. A written presentation submitted to the college President will help in the decision making process. The PLO’s have to be revised the year before the program is written. Some of the SLO’s are tied to the PLO’s so do we want to uniformly say the SLO’s have to be done at the same time as the PLO’s or let the departments decide? PLO’s must be completed the year prior to writing the program review. The SLO’s can be completed in the year or two prior to writing the program review.</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="924 535 1764 779"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">SLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">PLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Program</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">SLO’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Review</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> <td style="text-align: center;">COR’s</td> </tr> </table> <p>Training for our part-time faculty also requires follow-up after the fact. We can create an SLO and Program Review handbook and make sure it gets out to everyone. Will the new Program Review Coordinator be on the SLO committee? Yes, that is a good idea, they will also be on IEC and CIC.</p> <p>Assessment denominator statement needs to be clarified in the report. The denominator needs to be the students that are still in the class and participating in the assessment.</p> <p>We need to get a handle on the program deletion process or we will get caught though gainful employment. We need to clarify the deletion process and make sure that all areas are cleaned up with each deletion.</p>	1	2	3	4	5			SLO’s	PLO’s	Program			COR’s	SLO’s	Review				COR’s	COR’s		
1	2	3	4	5																				
		SLO’s	PLO’s	Program																				
		COR’s	SLO’s	Review																				
			COR’s	COR’s																				
5. Thoyote Review	C. Marvin	<p>Goal 1 Foster Student Success -</p> <p>Goal 2 Improve Student Affinity and Campus Engagement</p> <p>There is student success in the classroom and there is support outside the classroom. Ultimately they are related to each other. This goal is not as specified as goal 1 is. We</p>		X																				

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>need to specifically call out the online experience as well, we also need to call out early alert. A category of follow-up services, or early intervention. Maybe capturing AUO's for customer services in the Administrative Services, Financial Aid, A & R, Counseling, etc.</p> <p>The student experience survey would be conducted every two-years. It needs some extensive revisions. We will be doing CCSEESS this year, and we don't want to over survey the students. Heather and Michael will work together to revise the survey.</p> <p>2.2 should be directed towards the students and whether or not they feel same on campus. Goal 2 is specifically geared towards students and should remain that way. The employee satisfaction information can be moved to Goal 4.</p> <p>Goal 3 Respond to Community Needs</p> <p>Who are our underserved population? Are we getting them here and once here are we serving them? How does a number tell us we have met their need? Just because the number goes up or down does not mean you have or have not met the need.</p> <p>The idea of 3.1 was there is a demand out there that we are meeting. But when it goes down does it mean you are not meeting the need? Not all measures have to go up, some you actually want to go down.</p> <p>3.2 Currently contains CTE FTES and maybe it should be focused on community and contract ed. CTE makes sense because they provide certificates and immediate employment training. Add number of community members on advisory committees.</p> <p>Goal 4 Ensure Institutional Effectiveness</p> <p>4.1 is the fiscal piece for the college.</p> <p>4.2 is employee performance and development and we need to begin tracking employee professional development.</p> <p>4.3 needs a name change. Assessment & Planning Measures for Continuous Quality</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>Improvement.</p> <p>Next meeting is March 17 but we have several program reviews. Cancel faculty chairs on February 24 and we will schedule IEC 2/24/14 from 1:00 – 3:00. Corey will send the program review rubric out.</p>		
<p>6. Assessment Instrument of ourselves</p>	<p>C. Marvin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. * There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. * There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes. * There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes. <p>I've asked you to think about how these four bullet points can be assessed.</p> <p>In a similar way, the Program Review and the SLO committees will be using the bullet points at the SCQI level in their rubrics (attached) for the same purpose. So far, so good.</p> <p>It occurred to me yesterday that we could do a version of what the ACCJC did for SLO's. In 2012, they asked colleges to submit a report in which the college 1) addressed every bullet point in the rubric, 2) cited details, specific instances, and evidence, and 3) wrote no more than 250 words per bullet. The colleges turned this report in and then were subsequently graded (as you have seen) on a 1-5 point scale for each of their answers.</p> <p>So we do a version of that: the three committees submit a simple report at the end of the year, which would be narrative in form and address all bullet points--say by April 30. They keep the answers to 250 words per bullet and cite evidence. And then IEC scores the narrative according to rubrics we develop, which would happen in early May.</p> <p>What I like about this is 1) the reports are concise and focused, 2) the tasks are well-defined and delimited: the committee writes a descriptive summary in everyday language on its side, IEC applies the rubric on its, and 3) summary and evidence are</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>presented just like they would be for an accreditation report.</p> <p>One obvious asymmetry is that IEC would be writing and scoring its own efforts for institutional planning. I don't see anyway around that unless College Council does it. Even if IEC does it itself (which I think it should), the steps will be separate enough.</p> <p>What do you think?</p> <p>In the end, it would be these four reports (budget development would have to be included) completed annually and the survey done once every three years that constitute our evaluation instrument. We could even discuss doing the reports less often than that--every two or even three years if yearly is too often, if there's not enough change year to year--as long as whatever we do is on a regular basis.</p> <p>Budget Development committee evaluation – was the process followed appropriately? The budget committee should determine if they followed the process and did the right dollars go to the right place. How do you ultimately get at that information? How do will the budget development committee know if the dollars were spent appropriately? Did dollars follow program improvement? One piece missing are the priority numbers. How does the budget committee know if the dollars directed to a specific program are used as intended? ACCJC will ask how we know the dollars are used to best serve the educational needs of the students</p>		
7. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	<i>None</i>		
8. Future Agenda Items		None		
9. 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				

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
10. Adjourn		3:03 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed