



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 February 24, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Corey Marvin, Vivian Baker, Bill Locke, and Tammy Kinnan.

Absent: Heather Ostash, Gale Lebsock, Jill Board, Laura Vasquez, 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	C. Marvin	Action items: None Minutes from		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Program Review a. Human Services b. Liberal Arts, Arts & Humanities	C. Marvin	a. Human Services – Needs Improvement returned with recommendations Spelling errors, missing ODS data, real problem with curriculum itself. Require core cores of English 101 for Certificate. Argument is if getting degree Eng 101 reqd. Students can avoid ENGL101 if taking pre-reqs. This needs to go back to CIC since they are dropping Speech 105 and they can decide if they truly want ENGL 101 or ENGL 70. Certificates are a lower level of expectations than the degree. Overall impression was not very good. The five years of data supplied was not included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue with stop out points, the problems with the internships were not clearly explained. • The employer survey is not adequately mapped to the PLO's. • Questions about program matrix. • Deficient SLO #6 for HMSV C103 has no improvement plan. 		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical validation under conditions of enrollment not a true statistical validation. • Are ENGL 101 and CSCI 101 core skills or pre-requisite skills? • Are there little pieces of GE embedded in this PR, and if so they need to be discussed? • Employment rate is 1 in 3 and is the program satisfied with this? <p>b. Liberal Arts, Arts & Humanities – Acceptable with recommended changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENGL 102 in the SLO to PLO mapping grayed out • Wrong form – the group used last year’s form • Does not take a strong stand on the PLO progress, they cannot plan to plan. RECOMMENDATION: The three year plan goals specific how the PLO’s will be revised to address the concerns of the SLO committee • AAT – what action are they taking as the enrollment diminishes? • Some better more thorough description of students who pursue the degree. 		
<p>5. Planning Cycle Evaluation Instruments</p> <p>a. Program Review Committee</p> <p>b. Student Learning Outcome Committee</p> <p>c. Institutional Effectiveness Committee</p>	C. Marvin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. planning process in place 2. dialogue / qualitative and quantitate data 3. planning process is revised 4. commitment to it/demonstrable priority <p>Ask the three committee to write up 250 words per and score based on the bullet points provided.</p> <p>Program review report in April would say where the college is for each of the bullets. The committee would provide examples through the meeting minutes.</p> <p>SLO Committee would write 250 words which is approved through the committee and submitted to the IEC for scoring. The only problem with the plan is how do we norm a 3, or 2, or 1? How do we determine we are actually</p>		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>achieving the SCQI level at each of the levels? Meeting minutes will be helpful, and there can be additional check boxes and a short written statement of what was covered. The SLO committee is determining where we are college wide and at the committee level. They are self-evaluating at the same time.</p> <p>We do a lot of really good work but, we are not really good at informing our stakeholders of where we are and all the work we have done. This would be a great thing to do at the beginning of each semester during flex day.</p> <p>We will provide the bullet points to the committees, and each committee will be asked to give a descriptive summary with a maximum of 300 words per bullet points. The report is due to the IEC committee by April 15th.</p> <p>This would go to College Council and shared in report format during faculty flex days, and posted on the college website. Eventually, this will all go into a college scorecard.</p> <p>These areas will be required to provide the descriptive summary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Program Review Committee b. Student Learning Outcome Committee c. Institutional Effectiveness Committee <p>ACCJC has new accreditation standards out for a first reading in January 2014 and it is anticipated they will be approved at the June board meeting. We will be addressing the new standard in 2018 when we write our next report.</p> <p>ACCJC has Online Accreditation Basics training available. Everyone on IEC, Program Review, and SLO committees should participate in the online training and you will receive a certificate upon completion.</p>		
6. Review Planning Cycle Survey		The survey is really good and will be ready to go soon. Only change required was the college name. Survey will be sent out via survey monkey and should		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		yield interesting results.		
7. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin			
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 February 24, 2014 (added 2/3/14) March 17, 2014 April 21, 2014 May 12, 2014				
10. Adjourn		2:32 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

O Open/**C** Closed