



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 March 17, 2014
 MB 212
 1:00

Present: Bill Locke, Laura Vasquez, Joshua Sine, Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Vivian Baker, Suzie Ama, Heather Ostash, Gale Lebsock, and Tammy Kinnan.

Guests: Valerie Karnes, Matthew Jones

Absent: Michael Carley

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	C. Marvin	1: p.m.		
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From February 3, 2014 & February 24, 2014	C. Marvin	Action items: From Action Item –None Minutes from February 3, 2014 & February 24, 2014 -		X
3. Approval of Agenda	C. Marvin	Approved as submitted		X
4. Institution Set Standards	M. Jones	The ad-hoc committee determined that “If” indicates no standard. Do we want to break out online and on-ground numbers? Ad-hoc committee said yes, but academic Senate said we should not break these out. Reporting completion rate number as percentage not a number. AS said no to reporting. Immediate – ACCJC due on 31, march. Various people working on the report. Last year we were asked to report on 5 categories, success, retention, number of completers, licensure pass rate, and employment rates. ACCJC External Evaluation Team Responsibilities for compliance with US Department of Education Regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards effectively address “success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission,. . . including as appropriate consideration of course completion, State licensing examinations, and job placement rates.” • Whether institutionally-developed standards to demonstrate student success are 	X	

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>being used by the accreditor in the accreditation assessment, and the institution's performance with respect to student achievement is assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards effectively address the quality of the institution or program in: "ensuring that any awarded academic credits/degrees/credentials conform to commonly accepted practice including time invested and content mastered." <p>Accreditation is a choice, and we pay dues to be a part of the accreditation process. Without our accreditation status, students are not a required. There are groups of faculty that may not be pleased about standards being set, and it can become a political football or not, do we want to play football or not.</p> <p>Faculty are concerned and there is a great deal of push-back from last year. Reporting standards that are not necessary to report. Are we hanging ourselves?</p> <p>We were pressed to report and did what we thought was best for the college and students by reporting. As an institution we should have 5-6 things that are important to us. They may be the same as last year or may be different. They should be at a level which we are not comfortable slipping below that standard. If we do fall below the level, we need to have a plan in place to get back to the level of SCQI. When colleges ignore the process it presents an issue during the visit.</p> <p>Legislation has recently been enacted and we currently have the opportunity to take advantage of having control of where we go with this right now. If we ignore this or try to go three levels below we will be given more defined direction and the opportunity will be taken away.</p> <p>The mission of the college drives the direction of the college and how we serve the students is directly linked to the mission.</p> <p>It's not ACCJC that the faculty don't trust, it is the State that they do not trust. The State is dictating what the faculty will teach and the AA-T/AS-T degrees are a sign of this. The specific conversations related to how ACCJC will affect faculty specifically will make a difference. We will all be measured on a different scorecard and three other measures. One is FTES per student and one is FTES per completion. So now you either tell your side of the story or decide what you are going to do about the story. Defining the standards if it said "if".</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<p>This is what we reported last year:</p> <p>Course Completion – 66%</p> <p>Student Retention – 35% (fall to fall) (“persistence”)</p> <p>Student Degree Completion – 225</p> <p>Student Transfer Completion – 75</p> <p>Student Certificate Completion – 55</p> <p>We would review the Institution Set Standards every three years.</p> <p>Continue as we have in past, and then place on three year review timeline. Indicate on report that we are on a three-year timeline with strategic plan and mission. This will be reviewed next year with the standards and also included in the participatory handbook. We did our best guess with the limited time to work on the report and in the future we will have additional information from Achieving the Dream implementation and will be able to better assess the and address in the future.</p> <p>Action Item – The ACCJC Annual Report will be included in the same review cycle as the standards, mission, strategic plan, and will be included in the participatory handbook. Responsible party – Jill Board. Due Date – April 21, 2014.</p>		
<p>5. Program Reviews</p> <p>a. Liberal Arts: Math & Science</p> <p>b. Liberal Arts: Social & Behavioral Science</p>	C. Marvin	<p>Liberal Arts: Math & Science – Weak, return for revisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong form used – used last year’s form not current form • No appendix • Program strengths, weaknesses, three and six year goals were the same for all three program reviews. • SLO and PLO assessment was very weak. Did not list plan to fix. • A list of PLO’s would have been helpful. Programs don’t have capstone classes. • Math was not addressed • Did not address other campuses <p>Liberal Arts: Social & Behavioral Sciences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong form used – used last year’s form not current form • No appendix 		X

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program strengths, weaknesses, three and six year goals were the same for all three program reviews. • SLO and PLO assessment was very weak. Did not list plan to fix. • A list of PLO's would have been helpful. Programs don't have capstone classes. • The verbiage was way to similar for each of the LA program reviews. <p>We need to make sure each of the statements are accurate and can be validated. The program review committee will take over from this point forward on all program reviews.</p>		
6. Survey	C. Marvin	<p>Sub-heading were added for clarity. There were changes made to the survey. The survey will be out for a few weeks and we will share the results once they have been collected. We will be putting a public face on many of the areas via the website. This is the survey to evaluate our effectiveness, and we have the survey that will evaluate College Council. This is all part of our report out in the fall along with College in Review. This is something that needs to be reported out and if the results are available, they can reported out in May at the Classified Appreciate Day. People will be more likely to respond if they know when the results will be released. People are looking for the information from the climate survey that was done just recently. This survey and the survey from College Council will be conducted every Spring and the results will be disseminated during the Fall Faculty Flex Days.</p>		
7. Mid-term Progress Reports	C. Marvin	<p>Due March 1st, not a huge amount of participation and only ½ of them were received. Reminded faculty chairs to complete these. There were to serve as a check in at the mid-year point for what they said they would do. They should go to Budget Development for review to determine if the money was used for the requested purpose. We are not to the point of determining effectiveness yet. Most take the budget development process must more seriously now that they are asked to come to BDC for clarification. It will provide information on departments that are making progress towards their goals and effectively using their resources. It should also go to the faculty chair meeting. There is no direct connection between goals and the dollars allocated.</p>		

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		AUP changes for equity – the information that faculty chairs get is disaggregated. There may be a slight revision to prompt any specific disaggregated data patterns.		
8. Review of Action Items	C. Marvin	Action Item – The ACCJC Annual Report will be included in the same review cycle as the standards, mission, strategic plan, and will be included in the participatory hand book. Responsible party – Jill Board. Due Date – April 21, 2014.	X	
9. Future Agenda Items		None		
10. 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				
11. Adjourn		3:14 p.m.		

Facilitator: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Tammy Kinnan

Open/ Closed