Institutional Effectiveness Committee
November 13, 2017
EW 207
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Present: Ryan Khamkongsay, Suzie Ama, Jan Moline, Ben Beshwate, Lisa Couch, Stephanie Brantley, Vivian Baker, Corey Marvin, Jill Board, Heather Ostash

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
1. Call to order	Corey Marvin	2:02 p.m.		X
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From:	Corey Marvin	From: 09/11/2017 Action items: • *Add Visual and Performing Arts to 2019 Program Review List* • *Give IR back end reporting access in eLumen* • *Suzie succession planning* • *Corey to follow up to insure ILO's were updated in catalog* • *Corey, Heather and Ryan to get together, revise Thoyote, and bring back to the group.- Bring to the next IEC Meeting (January)*		X
3. Approval of Agenda	Corey Marvin	Approved with the following changes: add eLumen Update		X

4. Place of new entities in annual planning
    a. IR
    b. Safety & Security
	Corey Marvin	Safety & Security: give Greta 1 year cycle before requiring her to submit (Spring 2019)
		Action Item: Vivian to send outcomes suggestions to Lisa Couch for review.
		IR: Add IR to the resource request to the AUP. Add to Program Review and AUP cycle (Spring 2020)
		
		1) Program Review Committee
		If Instructional, has to go to Academic Senate.
		    1) Academic Senate Executive Council
			X	

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		2) Academic Senate 3) College Council 4/5, 4/19, 5/3 (if needed) Action item: Jennifer Curtis to schedule a College Council Meeting for 4/26 for program review/budget development		
5. Review Standard 1.B	Corey Marvin	## Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness ### Academic Quality I.B.1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial <mark>dialog</mark> about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. ***Evidence of Meeting the Standard*** Cerro Coso Community College demonstrates a broad-based, intentional, and inclusive commitments to the components of this Standard. ***Student Outcomes*** The College maintains an Outcomes Assessment Committee that is an associated committee of College Council. The committee has a participatory governance structure with representation from all employee groups and is charged with providing "oversight for the College's outcome assessment processes and documents in order to improve student learning and achievement" **(I.B.1.1).** The committee began as a subcommittee of the academic senate solely focused on student learning outcomes (SLO's). But in recognition that outcomes assessment is a college-wide effort not just pertaining to instructional programs, the academic senate subcommittee's charge was broadened in fall 2013 to include administrative and classified representation and the committee repositioned under College Council **(I.B.1.2)**. Nevertheless, the committee maintains its faculty emphasis as more than half the representation is reserved for faculty **(I.B.1.1)**. And a faculty member is also the committee's chair. As a sign of the College's commitment to supporting and improving student outcomes that faculty leadership position carries with it ongoing reassigned time.	X	

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Dialogue is substantive, intentional, and inclusive. Outcomes assessment is not just discussed at the committee but also in faculty chair meetings **(I.B.1.3)**, program review committee meetings **(I.B.1.4)**, curriculum committee meetings **(I.B.1.5)**, and department meetings for both instructional and non-instructional units **(I.B.1.6)**. The annual integrated planning template prompts all departments and units to identify outcomes assessed, analyze the reason for missed targets, and describe any changes made for the improvement of operational effectiveness and/or student learning and achievement in the prior year **(I.B.1.x)**. This college-wide dialogue has led to concrete improvements in both instructional and non-instructional units as detailed more fully directly below in Standard I.B.2 and also in Standard II.A.3. (Page 19) ***Student Equity*** Cerro Coso Community College supports sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue about student equity primarily through the Student Success and Support Council (SSSC). This group was formed in 2013-2014 as a successor to the matriculation and the basic skills committees, combining the work of the two prior groups. In 2015-2016, when student equity became a focus supported by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the charge and composition of the Student Success and Support Council were revised to reflect its role as a participatory governance committee reporting to College Council, reflecting the belief that student success and equity are the business of the entire college **(I.B.1.9)**. In 2015, the College created a full-time management position in student equity in order to sustain efforts and resources on this focus **(I.B.1.10)**; the position was hired permanently in 2016. Dialogue about equity takes place at several levels. As noted above, the Student Success and Support Council is the primary institutional body for reviewing equity data, analyzing trends, and guiding improvements. The group meets twice a month during primary terms and reviews disaggregated data such as the Student Success Elements reports generated annually by the Kern Community College District (KCCD) institutional research office **(I.B.1.11)**. At the department and unit levels, specific language was added to the integrated planning templates in 2015-2016 to prompt equity dialogue at faculty chair and department meetings **(I.B.1.12)**. This was supported by the inclusion of disaggregated student access and performance data as part of the "program review" reports provided each year by KCCD IR in preparation for the integrated		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		planning cycle **(I.B.1.13)**. Finally, substantive and intentional dialogue takes place each year as part of professional development activities focused on equity. Examples in recent years are presentations by Cabrillo professor Diego Navarro in 2014-15 to faculty and classified staff at two faculty flex days, one adjunct professional development day, and a classified staff all-staff meeting **(I.B.1.14)**, ==as well as presentations at faculty flex days, administrative retreats, and classified all-staff meetings on the RP Group's Six Student Success Factors **(I.B.1.15)**.== ==(Add SSSP and Umoja)==		
		Academic Quality		
		Review, renewal, and improvement of academic quality take place continually throughout the institution in all the capacities described in more detail in Standard II. For the purposes of this Standard, the College ensures broad-based and inclusive dialogue on academic matters primarily through the participatory governance committees of SSSC and program review. As noted above, SSSC developed out of the previous matriculation and basic skills committees and in 2015-2016 was revised to be a participatory governance committee reporting to College Council with the specific charge to blend academic affairs and student services in the service of academic quality: "Through the integrated efforts of academic and student services, the Student Success and Support Program Committee reviews and recommends strategies and initiatives to help students achieve success" **(I.B.1.19)**. The Program Review Committee, similar to the Outcomes Assessment Committee noted above, started as a subcommittee of the academic senate but was revised into a participatory governance committee when program reviews were required from all non-instructional as well as instructional units. Its charge is likewise first and foremost in the service of academic quality assurance: "To provide oversight of the College's program review processes and documents in order to improve student learning and achievement" **(I.B.1.x)**. Like the Outcomes Assessment Committee, the majority representation remains faculty **(1.B.1.20)**. And also like the other committee, a faculty member is the committee chair with committed, ongoing reassigned time. ==(Focus on program review outcomes)==		
		Dialogue in both of these committees are substantive and collegial. In 2016-2017, one goal planned for and achieved by the SSSC was to play a more central role in beginning, deepening, and sustaining dialogue about institutional effectiveness in improving student achievement **(I.B.1.21)**. This resulted in the		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		creation of a set of four inquiry groups in spring 2017 to research best practices around the Student Success Factors of "Directed," "Focused," and "Connected." These best practices were packaged into three initiatives that were adopted by instructional departments in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 as part of a year-long effort to scale up best practices in academic quality **(I.B.1.22)**. Nor were the effort limited to instructional units. The Six Success Factors were also the main topic of a classified and administrative all-staff meeting in May 2017, with the outcome that each of the College's major campus locations—Ridgecrest, Mammoth, Bishop, Lake Isabella, and Tehachapi—put on successful welcome back barbeques to help students feel more connected **(I.B.1.23)**.

As described in more detail in Standard II.A.16, the program review committee supports the writing of all college program reviews, instructional and non-instructional alike. This provides for a more broad-based and intentional dialogue around the work of individual units, their connection to the mission, their evaluation, and their goals. All instructional program reviews are presented to the academic senate for discussion and acceptance **(I.B.24)**. All program reviews of every kind—instruction, student services, learning support services, and administrative services—are presented at College Council likewise for discussion and acceptance **(I.B.1.25)**.

Institutional Effectiveness
As with the other components of this Standard, Cerro Coso Community College sustains an associated committee of College Council that provides for substantive and collegial dialogue in this area. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) is charged with "providing oversight to the planning and assessment processes to develop and maintain sustainable continuous quality improvement" (I.B.1.31). Though it is composed of specific positions (vice president of instruction, student learning outcomes coordinator, etc.) rather than elected representatives from constituent groups, it is evenly balanced between administration and faculty, with classified representation.

The purpose of using specific positions is so that dialogue at IEC can flow directly in and out to the planning and assessment committees it is directly responsible for—student learning outcomes, program review, and budget development, all of whose chairs are on IEC—and from there to the faculty, staff, and administrative representatives that make up those committees. The committee itself meets several times each semester, evaluates the performance of its associated committees, identifies gaps, and sets goals. | | |

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		The work of the committee is made public mostly through the work of its associated committees. But the committee has a standing report at College Council **(I.B.1.31)**, submits an annual College Report Card **(I.B.1.32)**, and also prepares the <mark>Progress Report</mark>, the institution's periodic newsletter of all things "institutionally effective" **(I.B.1.33)**. However, the continuous improvement of institutional effectiveness for student learning and achievement is, in the last analysis, the purpose of almost all collegial dialogue at the institution. As described more fully in Standard I.B.9 below, the College's integrated planning effort engages institutional dialogue at all levels: departments and units write annual unit plans; sections and divisions analyze, aggregate, and review the grassroots plans; support committees and groups develop work plans; College Council oversees the process. The annual integrated planning cycle at these levels requires substantive and intentional dialogue on the linkages between the college mission, the three-year strategic plan, individual unit mission and goals, student outcome data, equity data, program review, and student performance data **(I.B.1.34, I.B.2, I.B.3).** As described more fully in Standard IV.A, the College has a committee structure that provides the organizational means for dialogue that is intentional and inclusive. At the institution's core, College Council is a conduit for receiving and disseminating information throughout the college and acts as an advisory committee to the president. It is the purpose of College Council to engage in ongoing evaluation and improvement of the College's mission, vision, participatory process, and institutional planning. It has ultimate responsibility for the strategic direction of the College and through its subcommittees for. College Council includes representation from all campuses, and all meetings are delivered via interactive video to be accessible at a distance **(I.B.5).** Other campus groups and committees participate in institutional dialogue. In addition to the areas listed above, the participatory committees of College Council are also responsible for budget development, facilities, professional development, accreditation, technology, and safety and security. The Academic Senate is primarily responsible for all academic and professional matters, including program development and curriculum. Faculty chairs recommend scheduling both on the short- and long-term to meet student need. Student Services Executive Council ensures that student and learning support services are equitably delivered at all campus locations.		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		<mark>[Different sites- Weave in participation at various sites as they are a part of the whole]</mark> To ensure coordination of effort and communication, the three chief officers of the major divisions—academic affairs, student services, and administrative services—meet regularly and also serve as resources to each other's steering groups. • All chief officers meet once a month with the president in the president's Executive Cabinet. • All chief officers are standing members of IEC • All chief officers are standing members of the Budget Development Committee • The vice president of instruction participates on the Student Services Executive Council • The vice president of student services participates on the faculty chair working group • Both the vice president of instruction and the vice president of student services sit together on the curriculum committee and on the SSSC • At least one member of the executive team attends each Academic Senate meeting. ## Analysis and Evaluation The College meets this standard. Cerro Coso Community College demonstrates a strong commitment to dialogue that is sustained, substantive, and collegial. The ongoing discussion taking place among the different employee groups, different sites, and the different operational divisions has the effect of breaking down silos and ensuring broad communication among the College's functional areas. It fosters a collective understanding of the different way the different functional areas engage student learning and achievement and improve institutional processes, as well as the way each contributes to the success of the others. ## Evidence I.B.1.1 Participatory Governance Model, pg. 40 I.B.1.2 College Council Minutes showing approval of SLO as associated committee of CC		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		I.B.1.3 faculty chair minutes showing SLO dialogue		
		I.B.1.4 program review committee minutes showing SLO dialogue		
		I.B.1.5 CIC minutes showing SLO dialogue		
		I.B.1.6 Department minutes showing SLO dialogue, both instruction and non-instruction		
		I.B.1.x Annual Unit Plan Template showing outcomes assessment pages		
		I.B.1.7 Sample PLO results for instr and non-instr programs in recent program reviews		
		I.B.1.8 PLO results screenshot on program page and examples		
		I.B.1.x College Report Card 2017, SLO section		
		I.B.1.y Progress Report, 20170301		
		I.B.1.9 College Report Card 2016, pg. 6		
		I.B.1.10 Student Equity Director job description		
		I.B.1.11 Elements of Student Success, 2017		
		I.B.1.12 AUP Template showing equity pages		
		I.B.1.13 Sample annual unit plan data showing disaggregation in access and success		
		I.B.1.14 Diego Navarro sample agendas		
		I.B.1.15 Agendas from Success Factor events for faculty flex, classified, and admin		
		I.B.1.16 2017 equity plan		
		I.B.1.17 KCCD IR splash page showing all Student Success Elements reports		
		I.B.1.18 Progress Report 20170510		
		I.B.2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. {SLO's}		
		Evidence of Meeting the Standard Student learning assessment is central to Cerro Coso Community College's mission to produce and support student success; to educate, innovate, inspire, and serve our students and community. Cerro Coso embraces the idea that self-		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		assessment is a natural extension of instruction and student services, and all members of the College share in this responsibility. The SLO Committee's charge is "To act as a standing committee to promote student learning and institutional effectiveness by providing leadership in continuous and sustainable assessment and to foster a culture of inquiry" and to provide "oversight for the College's outcome assessment processes and documents in order to improve student learning and achievement" **(l.B.2.1 and l.B.2.2).** The SLO Committee provides vision and support in the development, assessment, and evaluation of learning outcomes. {Add GELOS?} The College maintains a planning section on the website, where SLO resources and data are housed. Formal and informal resources are available for faculty, staff, students, and the public. These resources highlight best practice and effective strategies in learning outcome assessment and can provide guidance for faculty and staff, and a context through which to interpret the information for students and the public. Program Learning Outcome information is visible and easily accessible, linked on the program's page **(l.B.2.3).** The SLO Coordinator is available to meet with groups of faculty or staff to provide guidance and support in assessment efforts. In consultation with the SLO Committee, the Coordinator prepares an Annual Assessment Report (replaced the Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report) addressing LO progress, and assessment of institutional practices in support of outcome assessment **(l.B.2.4).** Outcome questions are included in the IEC Annual Assessment Report survey (disseminated every other year), as another means to measure awareness, engagement, and identification of outcome assessment training and support needs. The report is reviewed in IEC, along with the goals the SLO Committee has set for continuous quality improvement **(l.B.2.5).** The SLO Coordinator is a member of the Curriculum and Instruction, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committees (CIC and IEC). These measures ensure continuous monitoring of outcome assessment practices to ensure quality and consistency from identification of learning outcomes in the course outlines through the assessment cycle. Learning outcomes are defined and assessed at the course (CSLO), program (PLO), unit (AUO), and institutional level (ILO). CSLOs map to PLOs and to ILOs **(l.B.2.5).** Data reflects all offerings including online/on-ground, and full time/part time faculty. Outcomes assessment data is used for planning and improvement for all courses, programs, units, and the institution. Programs and		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		departments make modifications to courses and programs; as discussed in II.A.3, the CIC ensures that programs, degrees, and certificates remain current with all courses and programs being evaluated by the department and submitted to CIC for revision at least once in a five year period. The development, assessment, and analysis of student learning outcomes are the result of campus-wide collaborations an dialogue, largely occurring within departments for programs and course assessment **(I.B.2.6).** Programs evaluate CSLO and Unit data each year in the Annual Unit Plan (AUP). Programs and units connect learning, service, and resource requests directly to the college's mission and strategic goals. CSLO, PLO, and AUO data is used to identify resources needed to enhance or scaffold student learning, including remediation and intervention, and is reported in the AUP. The AUP and Program Review templates require programs and units to link outcome data to budget requests. The SLO committee reviews each AUP and identifies common themes across courses, programs, services and the institution. This information is used to inform discussions and training at all levels. The AUP has been revised to increase reporting on assessment and related initiatives, and to include identification of themes. Annual Unit Planning templates **(I.B.2.7)** include the following: • Outcomes Assessment: Actions taken – describe improvements the department made as a result of outcomes assessment. For instructional units, these might be improvements in course content, pedagogy, methods of evaluation, textbook adoption, etc. For non-instructional units, it might be a change in operations, adjustment in work flow, expansion, etc. • Outcomes Assessment: Outcomes assessed – list all outcomes assessed in the previous year • Outcomes Assessment: Gaps to be added – SLOs assessed in the immediately preceding academic year that missed the target. Identify the type of gap detected: refer to the SLO Assessment Committee Themes **(I.B.2.8).** Outcomes are aggregated and analyzed to identify themes and inform instruction and services. All CSLOs and PLOs are assessed at least once during the program review cycle of five years. The SLO Committee has recommended Programs assess CSLOs in the first three years, PLOs in year four, and		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		extensively analyze the data for Program Review in year five. For all assessments, if gaps are detected, appropriate remediation will be implemented and the learning outcome will be reassessed prior to the program review. The College's 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. Faculty Chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessment connect within the individual programs **(I.B.2.9).** The Program Review template now includes a chart for future assessments (5 year plan identifying when CSLOs and PLOs will be assessed). This information will also be input into eLumen, prompting faculty and staff when scheduled assessments are due.		

The college is now counting all courses and programs in the catalog when factoring the percent assessed. This resulted in lower percentages in 2014/2015. Concerted effort has been made to delete courses and programs that are no longer viable, and to asses those without prior assessment. Assessment statistics**(I.B.2.10)**:

Year	Percent of Courses Assessed	Percent of Programs Assessed
2014-2015	62.53%	71.43%
2015-2016	80.88%	91.67%
2016-2017	88.66%	94.44%
2017-2018	90.91%	100%

The instructional and non-instructional program review template requires detailed and specific analysis of learning outcomes, including how well students are achieving the learning outcomes, along with identification and analysis of trends and gaps. The SLO Committee recognized a gap in the Program Review process and recommended programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete Program Review. The language was added to the Program Review template and communicated to Department Chairs

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		during the Fall 2015 Program Review Training **(l.B.2.11).** Over the next few years the target will move to somewhere in the 90's, allowing for new courses which may have been added, but have not yet been offered enough to have adequate assessment data. Additionally, the portion of the Program Review related to learning outcomes is presented to the SLO Committee prior to being reviewed by the PR Committee, and when necessarily, the SLO Coordinator will attend the PR Committee meeting to provide direct support. This has led to revision of PLOs for the next revision cycle, as well as identifying areas for more meaningful data gathering **(l.B.2.12).** {Program review} Cerro Coso Community College has had ILO's from almost the beginning of the SLO era. It established an ad hoc committee in 2007-2008, which developed a list of seven ILO's. The Colleges ILOs were assessed in 2011, identifying the need to redefine the ILOs and create a more direct and meaningful way to assess rather than relying solely on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. The College formed an Institutional Set Standard and ILO Task Force which met in spring 2015 through spring 2016. The College has adopted four new ILOs with the following recommendations: {ILO's mapped except Liberal Arts} 1. That ILO assessment results are to be gathered from students engaged in completing instructional programs 2. That each instructional program addresses all four of the ILO's listed below 3. That each instructional program maps from assessments already embedded in program courses, whether PLO's or course-level SLO's 4. That while the preferred method is one PLO or course-level SLO to one ILO for each program, the ultimate number of mappings depends on faculty judgment 5. That the implementation timeline, including any necessary adjustment to PLO's and/or course-level SLO's is the 2016-2017 academic year. Every program (certificate and degree) has completed mapping at least one CSLO to each ILO. This map is entered into eLumen and assessment data will be aggregated from embedded assessments **(l.B.2.13).** {Intentional dialog} As mentioned in l.B.l, intentional dialogue related to learning outcome data and student success takes place across the college, including venues such as College		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Council; monthly Faculty Chairs meetings; the Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcome and Curriculum and Instruction Committees, Department and Advisory meetings. The various levels work to identify themes from reporting instruments such as the AUP and Program Review, which then directly inform institutional planning and resource allocation. Divisions, Units, Programs and Departments must directly correlate LO assessment and student success to requests for resources. The SLO Committee's 2012 and 2013 Comprehensive Annual Reports identified that the primary theme for CSLO gaps between target and goal is attributed to "specific instruction techniques." This theme does not include course content, but rather connects with the need for professional development both within the Department and also for the faculty as a whole. The 2013-2014 Professional Development Resource Request identifies the goal of, "provide training to enhance student success with teaching techniques and technologies." Additional professional development has been provided as a result of identified gaps and is more fully discussed in ==Professional Development portion. {Corey to add}==		
		The student learning outcomes and competency levels for degrees, certificates, programs and courses must correlate and assessment data is examined to ensure pathways and learning outcomes are appropriate. Assessment results are integrated into planning and allocation, incorporating effectives in productivity, student learning and success. Faculty are involved in all areas related to learning outcome assessment, include learning outcomes on every course syllabus, and the evaluation process for both full-time and adjunct prompts reflection on assessment; specifically full time faculty are asked to provide a brief narrative summarizing assessment of SLOs in classes or service area, and explain how assessment findings influenced or informed his or her teaching or services; and adjunct faculty are asked to provide a brief summary of how assessment of SLOs informs his or her teaching **(I.B.2.14).**		
		## Analysis and Evaluation The College meets this standard. Cerro Coso Community College actively and meaningfully engages in assessment of student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student learning support services. Assessment data is used to inform decisions including content, services, and funding. Cerro Coso has steadily made improvements in assessment, and is moving towards having 100 % of courses, programs, and services assessed by fall 2018. Notably, Cerro		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Coso uses outcome assessment data in planning, identifying initiatives, and ultimately to improve student learning and services. **Evidence** I.B.2.1 SLO minutes 2/14/14 I.B.2.2 Participatory Governance Model, pg. 40 I.B.2.3 SLO Page, Faculty 411, https://www.cerrocoso.edu/academics/programs I.B.2.4 Annual Assessment Reports I.B.2.5 IEC Minutes I.B.2.6 Excel maps I.B.2.7 Department minutes, IEC minutes, PR, CIC minutes I.B.2.8 AUP Template Outcome portions I.B.2.9 SLO Assessment Committee Themes I.B.2.10 Faculty Chairs PLO Schedule 2015 I.B.2.11 Curriculum matrix I.B.2.12 SLO minutes, PR training fall 2015 I.B.2.13 SLO minutes 10/4/16, 3/7/17, 4/25/17, Program Review Minutes I.B.2.14 ISS-ILO Task Force Report 4/1/16 I.B.2.15 2017-20 Faculty Contract, 2015 Follow-up CR4-5 I.B.3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. **Evidence of Meeting the Standard** As noted above in Standard I.A.1, the College uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures to assess how effectively it accomplishes its mission. Chief among these is the institution-set standards. Cerro Coso Community College has had ACCJC-required institution-set standards since they were required by the Commission in 2014. These were revised once in 2015 and again in 2018. The following chart indicates the standards and the performance on those standards in the years indicated: {Address why 50%, publish IEPI's #'s (where did these numbers come from?)}		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP							O	C

	Standards Set in 2014	2014	Standards Set in 2015	2015	2016	2017
Successful course completion	66%	66.1%	64%	71.0%	70.2%	
Degrees	225	270	175	343	307	381
Certificates	55	122	55	183	145	149
Transfer	75	185	150	184	158	
Persistence – fall to fall	35%	34%				
Basic skills course success			50%	56.2%	55.8%	
Online course success			57%	61.7%	62.0%	
Examination Pass Rates						
Licensed Vocational Nurse	60%	77%	65%	78%	84%	
Emergency Med Technician	60%	80%	65%	86%	63%	
Job Placement Rates						
Business	50%	53.9%	50%	45.8%	50.0%	
Business Office Technology	50%	36.4%	50%	36.4%	38.5%	
Web Design	50%	50.0%	50%	42.9%	38.5%	
Computer Information Systems	50%	28.6%	50%	28.6%	0%	
Welding Technology	50%	65.8%	50%	65.0%	52.0%	
Medical Assisting	50%	68.8%	50%	66.7%	0%	
Licensed Vocational Nurse	50%	72.8%	50%	72.7%	63.6%	
Emergency Med. Technician	50%	100%	50%	50.0%	46.2%	
Child Development	50%	61.0%	50%	61.0%	56.8%	
Paralegal	50%	50.0%	50%	50.0%	50.0%	
Human Services	50%	60.0%	50%	60.0%	43.8%	
Administration of Justice	50%	77.3%	50%	77.3%	78.7%	

The revisions in spring 2015 were conducted by a task force established for that purpose together with recommending revisions to the college's institutional

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		learning outcomes and setting targets for the California Community College Chancellor's Office IEPI goals, first required in 2015. The task force calculated the average as well as one and two standard deviations, and indicated whether the trend was up or down. Much time was spent discussing one vs. two standard deviations and what was meant by "standard." In the end, the group recommended that an institution-set standard meant a "floor" measure that the College would mobilize significant resources for if falling short, which explains why some of the numbers went down even though exceeded by the performance. {Address changes made} In addition, it recommended that basic skills course success and online course success rates be included instead of persistence since these provide better alignment with the mission's emphasis on remedial instruction and serving students through distance education. And it recommended that the numbers for licensure pass rates and career technical education job placement rates be set by the department in consultation with the dean **(I.A.2.1)**. It was also determined at this time that since the standards are a measure of how well the College is achieving its mission, a regular review of the standards for relevance, currency, and appropriateness should be carried out at the same time and on the same three-year cycle as that for mission, vision, values, and strategic goals. These recommendations of the task force were discussed and approved by College Council in March 2015 and described in the 2015 ACCCJC Annual Report **(I.A.2.2, I.A.2.3)**. In 2018,…. **(I.A.2.4).** {Address any conversations that took place – task forces? Get with Jill} [publishes the information] ## Analysis and Evaluation The College meets the Standard. {Natalie, college report?} ## Evidence {Insert Evidence} {Add IR website & Jill's task force documents as additional evidence} I.B.4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its		

institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has formal and informal mechanisms for evaluating its variety of assessment activities. Formally, a systematic review is built into the integrated annual planning cycle for all levels of the institution, from the individual unit and department level to the division level of academic affairs, student services, and administrative services. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.9, every year units, sections, and divisions develop initiatives to be implemented in the following year. Plan proposers indicate to what extent initiatives are aligned with the College's strategic goals and core functions, including strengthening organizational effectiveness **(I.B.4.1)**. In this way, individual units, sections, and divisions are continually prompted to make improvements in institutional processes to support student learning and achievement. {FOCUS ON AUP}

Annual planning initiatives are tied to measures of success for clear assessment. During the year of implementation, all planning entities provide a mid-year progress report by March 1 **(I.B.4.2)**. After the end of the year, a final report is included in the following year's planning document, in which proposers are prompted to reference their measures of success **(I.B.4.3)**. In 2017, to better track the implementation of the initiatives while they are happening and strengthen the likelihood of success, lead (formative) measures were added to the template, as indicated in more detail in Standard I.B.9 below **(I.B.4.4)**. Training was provided to faculty chairs and administrators responsible for operational areas plans **(I.B.4.5)**.

In addition to the lead and lag measures of the integrated annual planning process that result in direct institutional change, the College uses a variety of other assessment data to improve its organizational processes. As explained in more detail in Standard I.A.2, the College uses data to measure how well it is achieving its mission and progress it is making on its three-year strategic goals. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.2 and Standard II.A.16, the College assesses student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes (PLO's), administrative unit outcomes (AUO's), and institutional learning outcomes. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.5, the College uses student performance data, student achievement data, operational data, and PLO and

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		AUO data in the program review process. As explained in more detail in IV.A.7, the College uses a variety of mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of its decision-making structure and participatory governance practices. The following are examples of recent institutional improvements that have taken place as a result of reviewing and analyzing assessment data. In 2016, due largely to responses on its evaluation survey, College Council put a greater effort on formalizing reporting out to and in from constituent groups **(I.B.4.6)**. In 2017, due largely to program review, the ~~Digital Media Arts~~ Web Professionals program revised its certificates and degrees to expand the skill sets of graduates **(I.B.4.7)**. In 2017, due largely to student equity gaps, the College applied for and was approved to start an Umoja program **(I.B.4.8)**. In 2017, due largely to responses on the Kern Community College District climate survey, the College revamped its professional development committee and program to improve opportunities and encouragement for professional development **(I.B.4.9)**. In 2017, due largely to data needs developing out of the integrated planning cycle, the College secured funding to start a college institutional research office **(I.B.4.10)**. In 2018, due largely to student performance in basic skills classes, the English and math departments implemented a corequisite model for accelerated learning at levels below transfer **(I.B.4.11)**. In 2017, due largely to results of the student satisfaction survey results and to annual unit planning, Financial Aid eliminated a barriers for students, greatly expediting processing of requests **(I.B.4.x)**. Informally, the institution relies on various internal groups and committees to provide on-going input into the processes at the institution. These groups include the academic senate, the faculty union, the classified senate, the classified union, Administrative Cabinet, and College Council. The senates, unions, and Administrative Cabinet provide feedback to College Council on areas in which they believe improvements can be made. In 2016, members of the classified staff came to the president to discuss morale and ways they could more effectively participate in college governance. The result was the separation of recognition activities from all-staff meetings **(I.B.4.12)**, creation of a monthly "meet and greet" to celebrate ~~classified promotion~~ employee milestones and longevity **(I.B.4.13)**, and the resuscitation of the classified senate with responsibilities clearly distinguished from the classified union **(I.B.4.14)**.		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Evaluation and Analysis The College meets this standard. Cerro Coso Community College generates a wide variety of assessment data as part of its planning and decision-making structure and uses the data to make improvements in institutional organization and processes. Assessment data drives college planning to improve student learning and student achievement. Institutional processes are organized and implemented to support student learning and student achievement. **Evidence** I.B.4.1 I.B.4.2 I.B.4.3 I.B.4.4 I.B.4.5 I.B.4.6 I.B.4.7 I.B.4.8 I.B.4.9 I.B.4.10 I.B.4.x I.B.4.11 I.B.4.12 I.B.4.13 I.B.4.14 I.B.5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. {Reference a fuller discussion (2.A non-instructional)} **Evidence of Meeting the Standard** Cerro Coso adheres to Title V requirements that all programs are reviewed once every five years, with CTE programs completing an occupational supplement		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		every two years. As explained in more detail in Standard II.A.16, program reviews analyze student learning outcomes and student performance data. They identify student need by citing such evidence as awards given, patterns of course scheduling and staffing, methods of delivery, and labor market demand. Program reviews require two- and five-year goals to be written so departments have action plans to directly measure improvements. As explained in more detail in Standard II.B, student services program reviews analyze to student achievement in student learning outcomes and service department outcomes. Student needs are analyzed evaluation of usage and satisfaction data. Two- and five-year goals similarly provide for evaluation of progress in an ongoing cycle. **Analysis and Evaluation** {Insert here} I.B.6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. {AB405 new mandate "% point gap data"} **Evidence of Meeting the Standard** Cerro Coso Community College understands the importance of analyzing learning outcomes and achievement data to identify underlying trends, and issues, such as those related to achievement gaps, opportunity gaps, learning gaps, and other inequities. Identified achievement gaps are discussed at the program and unit level, and by the Institutional Effectiveness, and the SSSP Committees. Learning outcomes: Data can be disaggregated to look at specific sites, modes of delivery, courses within a program. Cerro Coso is in the process of implementing eLumen and will begin collecting CSLO data by individual student. Banner will be integrated into eLumen, allowing units, departments and programs to examine and analyze learning outcome data in a variety of meaningful ways, including disaggregating learning outcome data by subpopulations at the course, program, and		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C

		institution level. {AB405}
		
		Achievement data:
		In 2013? Cerro Coso participated in the Achieving the Dream Initiative. Through this process, the College participated in data mining…. This process was the catalyst for increased dialogue related to student achievement, and disaggregated data. Faculty workshops, FIPs, Classified and staff training, … Formation of Student Success and Support Council…
		
		Achieving the Dream (ATD) resulted in the implementation of the Student Equity Plan mandated by the state. ATD also led the change in college culture to data-driven decision making, and assisted Cerro Coso in developing strategies to close identified gaps in student success and completion. The College provides disaggregated data for analysis in Annual Unit Plans, prompting programs, departments, and units to identify and implement initiatives to close gaps. There is correlation in the AUP between gaps, identified initiatives, and requests for resources needed to implement the initiatives.
		
		Programs are provided with disaggregated data on the following:
		• Student Success and Retention Rates (traditional, DE)
		   ○ Gender
		   ○ Age
		   ○ Ethnicity
		   ○ Ed Plan Completion
		   ○ Completed Matriculation
		   ○ Course Enrollments (traditional, DE)
		   ○ ATD
		
		2017-2019 Integrated Plan: Basic Skills Initiative, Student Equity, and Student Success and Support Program, Strategic Plan 2015-2018, Institutional Research role…. {VTEA, Datamart? AUP, Coursebook (ODS- Cognos), Launch board}
		
		## Analysis and Evaluation
		The College meets this standard. It has an action plan in place to mitigate disaggregating learning outcome data. eLumen is expected to be ready for assessment data beginning in spring 2018, and it is expected to take at least two years to accumulate enough data for analysis at the disaggregated level to be		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		meaningful. Programs, Departments, and Units will continue to analyze and address disaggregated achievement data in their Annual Unit Plans. Disaggregated learning outcome data will be analyzed, in conjunction with achievement data during the Program Review process. **1.B.7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission. {How are we evaluating IEC}** ### Evidence of Meeting the Standard One of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to further improve and integrate its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, identified goals, and a means to evaluate processes for effectiveness **(I.B.7.1)**. When the team returned in 2013, they noted that the College had made substantive progress in integrating the planning activities as described, but it had not fully completed the second half of the recommendation: implementing an effective evaluation instrument for planning **(I.B.7.2)**. As described in the 2014 Follow up Report and again in the 2015 Midterm Report, a two-part instrument for annually evaluating the College's planning processes was created and first implemented in Spring 2014 (**I.B.7.3, I.B.7.4**). One part is a comprehensive self-evaluation of each of the College's three major planning areas carried out by the steering groups responsible for each area: IEC for planning, the Program Review committee for program review, and the Outcomes Assessment Committee for outcomes. This part is an "insider's" view: an operational and functional assessment from those faculty and staff serving on the committees and having a level of specialized knowledge and institutional history. The second component is a survey of the field. In contrast to the insider's view, it gauges the college community's understanding of and satisfaction with institutional planning in the areas of "Mission and Institutional Goals," "College Planning," "Budget and Resource Allocation," and "Outcomes		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		and Assessment." The self-evaluation is done every year; the survey is done every other year. The results are gathered and discussed by IEC and posted annually as the College Report Card (**I.B.7.5, I.B.7.6**) In addition to this formal yearly evaluation, other assessments are conducted regularly and on an ad hoc basis to improve institutional effectiveness. In the annual integrated planning template, a short two-question survey solicits satisfaction and suggestions for improvements **(I.B.7.7)**. When IEC set about to revise the planning templates ahead of fall 2017, it asked for input from administrative cabinet and faculty chairs **(I.B.7.8)**. In 2017-2018, the College invited faculty and staff to take the Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool survey available to Achieving the Dream schools; results were gathered in spring 2018 and shared with president's cabinet, administrative cabinet, IEC, faculty chairs, and the student services executive council **(I.B.7.9)**. Input also occurs informally. In spring 2016, faculty chairs expressed a strong desire to see no revisions to the annual unit plan template (it had been revised each of the prior three years), and this wish was discussed at IEC and enshrined as a goal for 2016-2017 **(I.B.7.10)**. The result of this input have been continuing improvements to the College's institutional effectiveness practices and processes. The following are examples drawn from the last three years since the 2015 Midterm Report: • In 2015, a task force was formed to review and revise the College's institution-set standards, determine a process for how this review can be done ongoingly within Cerro Coso Community College's planning processes, and also review and revise the College's Institution Learning Outcomes (ILO's), which had not been revisited for many years. The result was a revised set of institution-set standards; a process to revisit the standards once every three years along with the College's mission, vision, values, and strategic goals; and a thorough re-envisioning of Cerro Coso Community College's ILO's **(I.B.7.11)**. • In 2015, the mission, charge, and composition of the Student Success and Support Council was revised to reflect its role as a participatory governance committee. • In 2015, the budget component of the integrated planning cycle was revised to remove redundancy: instead of proposers listing resource		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		needs in tables in the plan and transferring those figures to a separate spreadsheet, the tables were eliminated and the spreadsheets enhanced to include justifications and drop down menu choices.		
		• In 2015, outcome assessment histories were greatly elaborated in program reviews, including whether outcomes were met and, if not, when they were reassessed.		
		• In 2015, departments began working on a 5-year cycle indicating when all student learning outcomes (SLO's) and program learning outcomes (PLO's) in their areas will be assessed and also a more specific map-over of SLO's to PLO's so there is no doubt what specific assessment tool is used when it comes to assessing PLO's.		
		• In 2015, a gap was closed in the linkage between curriculum, program review, and SLO's: When faculty present courses and programs at the curriculum committee, they are now asked when the last time the course was assessed and how the assessment results informed the SLO/PLO and ultimately the course outline of record being presented.		
		• In 2016, specific language was added to the annual unit plan templates prompting units, sections, and divisions to not just identify gaps in student equity but design improvements.		
		• In 2016, a periodic newsletter called "The Progress Report" was created by the IEC to report out matters of quality assurance regarding student learning and achievement. The newsletter goes out to all employees and has included topics such as accreditation, integrated planning, outcomes assessment, student success and support program, and student equity, and progress on strategic plan goals.		
		• In 2016, PLO assessments were published on the college webpage. For the first year, only those instructional program that had completed a program review since 2015 were included. As ensuing program reviews are completed, their results will be posted under each program's PLO page and main information page.		
		• In 2016, a technical review stage was implemented in the program review process that includes review by manager or dean, department chair and/or department members, advisory committee, and the Outcomes Assessment Committee. This review by the Outcomes Assessment Committee strengthens the linkage between outcomes assessment and program review.		
		• In 2017, the integrated planning templates were substantially revised to		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		further declutter and streamline input and presentation of information (I.B.7.12) ## Analysis and Evaluation The College meets the Standard. The institution regularly reviews and assesses its institutional effectiveness practices and processes, including its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, <mark>resource allocation</mark>, and re-evaluation, to determine their efficacy. The institution uses the results from assessment processes to develop and implement plans for improvement. ## Evidence I.B.7.1 I.B.7.2 I.B.7.3 I.B.7.4 I.B.7.5 Planning Documents page screenshot showing annual College Report Card I.B.7.6 2017 College Report Card; 2016 College Report Card (showing survey) I.B.7.7 I.B.7.8 Minutes from admin cabinet and faculty chairs soliciting input to AUP revision I.B.7.9 I.B.7.10 2016 College Report Card, pg. 5 I.B.7.11 I.B.7.12 New template and also email that got sent to proposers listing changes I.B.7.13 I.B.7.14 I.B.7.15 I.B.7.16 I.B.7.17 I.B.7.18 I.B.8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. <mark>{How do we communicate?}</mark>		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Evidence of Meeting the Standard The College uses a number of formal and informal methods to report out the results of its assessment and evaluation activities. Student outcomes are made public to the community and to current and prospective students in program review documents linked from the College's program review page **(I.B.8.1)**. Since 2016, program learning outcomes (PLO's) for instructional programs completing program reviews are visibly posted on the degree and certificate information pages **(I.B.8.2)**. The work of the outcomes committee is summarized yearly in an annual report that is part of the college report card **(I.B.8.3)**. In 2017, the College's SLO status was the subject of one of the Progress Reports distributed by email to all employees **(I.B.8.4)**. {Presentations to Chamber Meetings, service clubs etc.} The equity work the College has done is published in the Student Equity plan linked from the institutional planning webpage **(I.B.8.5)**. In addition, annual progress on equity measures are found in the Student Success Elements reports posted on KCCD IR's website **(I.B.8.6)**. Since 2017, equity results are directly distributed to all college faculty and staff by means of periodic Progress Reports **(I.B.8.7)**. Quality in academic matters is published in a variety of ways. All program reviews are posted on the college Program Review webpage **(I.B.8.8)**. The College's progress on its core academic functions are available to the public on the college website in reports such as the annual Report to the Community **(I.B.8.9)**, Institution-Set Standards **(I.B.8.10)**, and the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiatives Targets **(I.B.8.11)**. Additional reports are available to the public on the KCCD IR website, such as Elements of Student Success, Common Measures, "Program Review" Data, Student Success Scorecard, IPEDS, and Student Right to Know **(I.B.8.12)**. Evaluation and assessment activities located in planning documents are made public on the integrated planning pages of the college website. The main page contains links to the regular planning documents the college prepares, archives of prior plans, and a notation when the next plan is due **(I.B.8.13)**. Links on the navigation bar in the left hand margin lead to the integrated planning subweb, where all unit plans, section plans, division plans, resource request analyses and		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		mid-year progress reports can be viewed. Drop-down menus at the top allow viewers to search by planning unit or by academic year **(I.B.8.14)**. These documents are posted on the website and always available for internal and external constituents to click on and see. In the last several years the College has taken strides to bring evaluation results to where stakeholders are. Internally, as noted directly above in Standard I.B.7, a periodic newsletter called the Progress Report was implemented in 2016 to report out matters of quality assurance in areas such as integrated planning, student equity, outcomes assessment, and progress on strategic plan goals **(I.B.8.15)**. This newsletter is sent directly to all members of the college community through the cc_all listserv and is embedded directly into the email so that it can be seen without additional clicking. In 2017, as the College neared the end of its three-year strategic planning period, several issues of the Progress Report were given over to reporting out the five strategic goals **(I.B.8.x)**. <mark>These documents were used by the task force to dialogue about and develop the new 2018-2021 Strategic Goals **(I.B.8.y)**</mark>. Another improvement in communication to the internal community, based on the results the biannual planning survey, was the implementation in 2015 of asking annual unit plan proposers to present their plans at College Council for wider distribution and understanding **(I.B.8.16)**. In the next year, the vice presidents were asked to start presenting division plans at spring faculty flex days **(I.B.8.17)**. At both these presentations, proposers are asked to summarize results of their prior year goals. Externally, the College prepares annual Reports to the Community that are distributed […] **(I.B.8.18)**. Also, the College prepares a monthly Coyote Howler that provides information regarding the interesting events and accomplishments that have occurred at the College and that is presented to the board of trustees **(I.B.8.19)**. <mark>{How do we get the word out?}</mark> ## Analysis and Evaluation The College meets this Standard. Cerro Coso Community College demonstrates that communication of its assessment and evaluation to internal and external		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		stakeholders occurs regularly. The strengths and weaknesses of the institution as identified by the assessment are clearly communicated to the college community in a variety of formal and informal methods. The data supported discussion on strengths and weaknesses is used to set institutional priorities. **Evidence** {Posted Communications from Academic Senate} I.B.9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. **Evidence of Meeting the Standard** Cerro Coso Community College employs a variety of plans as part of a comprehensive evaluation and planning effort. These plans work together to provide a complete picture of the short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services. As noted above in Standard I.B.7, one of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to further improve and integrate its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, and identified goals effectiveness **(I.B.9.1)**. At the time of the site visit, the College's annual integrated planning cycle had run one time and was still not fully integrated; different components of planning had independent timelines and triggers that appeared not to line up well—program review in particular. Before the 2013 Follow Up Report, the cycle, which had been implemented in 2011-2012, had been run another time and a number of changes had been made to more strongly integrate the separate components of program review, planning, outcomes assessment, and resource allocation. The changes were		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		accepted by the Commission and the College deemed to meet the Standard **(I.B.9.2)**. Since then, the College has run the cycle on an annual basis and made several further improvements. ### *Educational Master Plan* Cerro Coso Community College adheres to Title 5 regulations in producing a comprehensive or master plan **once every five years**. The purpose of educational master plan is to identify long-range instructional, student services, and facility needs of the college and provide a context for decision-making regarding academic affairs, student services, and administrative services **(I.B.9.3)**. The central component of the plan is an external environmental scan. This has been historically carried out by a third-party to objectively establish community profiles, labor market needs, and future areas of program growth in the College's service area. The last the external scan was conducted by Maas and Companies in spring and summer of 2017 and became part of the 2017-2022 Cerro Coso Community College Educational Master Plan. The result of the educational master plan is to drive the planning of capital expenditures in the areas of facilities (it feeds the district-wide capital expenditure plan) and to establish a vision and projections for more near-term institutional goal-setting based on the third-party corroborative information **(I.B.9.4)**. ### *Strategic Planning* In this context set by the educational master plan, institutional goals are reviewed and revised **once every three** years through the strategic planning process. As described more fully in Standard I.A.4 and evidence in the Participatory Governance Model handbook, strategic goals are reviewed and revised at the same time and on the same cycle as the institution's mission, vision, values, and institution-set standards. The institutional goals established in the strategic plan are integrated with and based on the mission and the context established by the educational master plan. Goal setting relies on data analysis from the mission review, performance on the institution-set standards, and successful accomplishment of prior strategic goals as measured by a variety of student learning, student achievement, equity, and operational metrics. ### *Program Reviews*		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		A second layer of assessment and planning at the College is carried out simultaneously at the department and unit levels. The most comprehensive of these is the program review, which is completed **once every five years**. Different from the institutional focus of the educational master plan and strategic plans, program reviews are focused on the long-term assessment and improvement of individual units and departments. At Cerro Coso Community College, program reviews are completed for all instructional degrees and certificates, all student services, and all administrative services operational units. Program reviews are also completed for information technology, marketing and public relations, and college human resources **(I.B.9.2)**. The program review process is described much more at length in Standards I.B.5 and II.A.x. Program reviews are directly integrated with institutional planning by addressing the program's connection to the college mission. CTE program reviews provide updates on the same labor market information and employer relationships evidenced in the educational master plan. For all departments and units, program reviews are integrated with outcomes assessment by directly analyzing and discussing the results of student learning/administrative unit outcomes and program level outcomes. They are integrated with the annual unit planning process by using the same data drawn from student demand, student performance, and student achievement that are provided for the annual unit planning process. They also discuss the same five resource request areas of staffing, professional development, facilities, information technology, and marketing, except from a five-year perspective instead of a one-year. ***Outcomes Assessment*** Also taking place at the individual department and unit level are the assessments of student learning outcomes (SLO's) and/or administrative unit outcomes (AUO's), which are on a set schedule of **up to five years**. Discussed much more fully above in Standard I.B.2, outcomes are a vital component of planning and resource allocation, as they identify potential gaps to be addressed. All instructional and non-instructional units are expected to complete all outcomes assessments, including program level outcome (PLO) assessments, at least once every five years. Some departments do it sooner. Outcome assessment results are integrated into the program reviews, where they are reported on, analyzed, and serve as the basis of dialogue about		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		change. They are integrated into the annual planning process where departments and units report out on actions taken and gaps identified in assessment activities undertaken in the prior year.		

Annual Planning Process

The annual planning cycle takes place **every year** and is the shortest-term planning undertaken by the College. It leads directly to department, section, and division initiatives for improvement and, through the development of budget worksheets, to resource allocation.

Unit Plans, due October 15

The cycle begins in the fall semester, as departments and operational units meet to plan for the next academic year (planning for academic year 2019-2020 takes place in Fall 2018, for instance). Prior to the beginning of the semester, instructional units are supplied with student performance and equity data from the previous five years, thus showing current trends and gaps **(I.B.9.3)**. Departments and operational units use this student achievement information, as well as progress made on program review goals, outcomes assessment, equity gaps, and prior year initiatives, to identify gaps, dialogue about improvements, plan goals for the following academic year, and propose a budget **(I.B.9.4).**

The result, due by October 15th of every year, is the annual unit plan (AUP). The unit plan template requires departments to review and analyze data in these areas:

Data Considered by Instructional Annual Unit Plans
1. Connection to college mission
2. Student demand
3. Student performance and achievement
4. Equity gaps
5. Progress made on last program review goals
6. Outcome assessment results
7. Progress made on last year's unit initiatives
8. College strategic goals
9. Three prior years' budget expenditures

The completed document contains not only initiatives to be attempted for the

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		following year but also a comprehensive budget worksheet with requests for staffing, facilities, supplies, equipment, travel, and marketing based on the goals and plans for improved student learning **(I.B.3)**. Every instructional department completes an AUP. The following non-instructional units also complete AUP's: • ACCESS programs (special services) • Admissions and Records • Athletics • Counseling • Equity • Financial Aid and Veterans' Affairs • Honors • Information Technology • Maintenance and Operations • Public Information/External Relations • Student Activities • Veteran's Affairs Because of the variety of the non-instructional units, the data used in the unit planning process for program evaluation mirrors those used by instructional units but varies with what is relevant to that program **(I.B.32).** Below is a summary of the types of data used.		

Data Considered by Non-Instructional Annual Unit Plans
1. Connection to college mission
2. Student demand
3. Student performance and achievement
4. Equity gaps
5. Progress made on last program review goals
6. Outcome assessment results
7. Progress made on last year's unit initiatives
8. College strategic goals
1. Usage Data and Statistics
2. Program specific data and results, such as placement results, success and retention data for programs such as EOPS and DSPS, amount of Financial Aid awarded, student satisfaction, etc.

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		9. Three prior years' budget expenditures		
		As with instructional departments, student services and administrative services units reflect on past performance, dialogue about their current status, and plan goals for the next academic year that address the college strategic goals and take into account any noteworthy budget forecasts. **Section and Division Plans, due November 15 and December 1** During the next two months, successive layers of planning are accomplished leading up to the educational master plan update. In the area of academic affairs, annual section plans (ASP's) are completed. These are plans for operational entities comprised of groups of departments or units working together, and there are five: Career Technical Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Eastern Sierra College Center, the Kern River Valley/South Kern Center, and CC Online **(I.B.33).** The ASP's provide a functional review at the next level up. Section directors and steering groups are review the AUP's of the units that comprise or affect their areas, dialogue with unit leaders as appropriate, winnow out untimely or unrealistic requests, and then write plans that capture goals the section can commit to for the following year. They analyze and synthesize the lower level plans to recognize places of overlap, distinguish trends, and identify spots where efficiencies can be gained from leveraging or combining resources. ASP's articulate needs in the five resource support areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. A key piece of this review involves resource allocation. Budget requests are scrutinized by the section leaders and steering groups, analyzed in context of the gaps and initiatives identified in the unit plans, and discussed with the unit proposer. The section leader completes a comprehensive budget worksheet, passing along resource recommendations that he or she can support and declining to pass along recommendations that he or she cannot. After the ASP's are the Annual Division Plans (ADP's), which is the final layer of review and aggregate planning. ADP's coincide with each of the College's functional divisions, one each for Administrative Services, Student Services, Academic Affairs, and President's Office. The chief officer of each division carries out this final review in the same way as above: analyzing and		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		synthesizing the lower level plans; bringing forth needs in the five areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing; and completing final comprehensive budget worksheets of supported expenditures **(I.B.34)**. **Resource Request Analyses, due February 15** <mark>{Add IR & Safety and Security}</mark> By December 1 every year, gaps have been identified in every unit, section, and division, goals set, and resources requested in the areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. At this point, 'second-level' plans are written that look at the resources across the college and aggregate them **(I.B.9.x)**. These resource request analyses have no set template and are completed by the following responsible parties: <table><tr><td>Facilities</td><td>Director, Maintenance and Operations</td></tr><tr><td>Information Technology</td><td>Director, Information Technology</td></tr><tr><td>Marketing</td><td>Manager, Public Relations, Marketing &Development</td></tr><tr><td>Professional Development</td><td>Vice President of Instruction, Faculty Flex Coordinator</td></tr><tr><td>Staffing</td><td>College President</td></tr><tr><td>{Human Resources}</td><td></td></tr></table> The purpose of the resource request plans is to look at all the plans together college-wide and determine whether trends, commonalities, and trade-offs exist and where efficiencies can be gained. The marketing and professional development plans also have the effect of identifying common threads that are established as priorities for the following year **(I.B.9.x)**. **Budget, due May 1**		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		The last piece of the integrated cycle is the college budget, which is finalized beginning February 15th. Throughout the cycle, all units, sections, and divisions have completed budget worksheets, all budget requests have been reviewed and prioritized at each successive level of the cycle, and commonalities and trends in the resource areas have been analyzed. The Budget Development Committee reviews the revenue projections for the following year, determines the extent of all budget requests, and makes recommendations on specific line items. If needed, the Budget Development Committee will get additional information or even meet with plan proposers. They will do this if there is a question about a line-item or there is a failure to come to agreement between unit, section, and/or division plan **(I.B.9.x)**. The result of this dialogue is a draft of the following year's adopted budget that is recommended to the president **(I.B.37).** As indicated above in Standard I.B.7, this resource allocation process is regularly evaluated as part of the overall assessment of the integrated planning cycle. Budget process fixes come out of the self-assessment that is done every year when a gap is identified, and questions about the budget process are included in the planning survey that goes out to all faculty staff every two years **(I.B.9.x)**. Here are examples of improvements in the resource allocation process that have come out of these assessments since 2015: • In 2015, the budget component of the integrated planning cycle was revised to remove redundancy: instead of proposers listing resource needs in tables in the plan and transferring those figures to a separate spreadsheet, the tables were eliminated and the spreadsheets enhanced to include justifications and drop down menu choices **(I.B.9.x)**. • In 2016, a 'one-time' code added into the budget worksheets to better distinguish program expenditures that are ongoing in nature—instructional supplies, non-instructional supplies, personnel, etc.—from special or unusual costs in any given year that 'spike' the budget. This was designed to help smooth out year-to-year budget analysis **(I.B.9.x)**. • In 2017, a rubric for prioritizing and analyzing budget requests was developed and piloted. It was first used by the committee in spring 2018 as a guide for discussions about particular line items **(I.B.9.x)**.		

TOPIC	INITIATOR	SUMMARY/ FOLLOW-UP	O	C
		Analysis and Evaluation The College meets this Standard. Cerro Coso Community College employs a comprehensive planning cycle that is designed to accomplish the mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality. This institutional planning happens on a regular basis, includes wide participation across the college-wide community, uses valid data sources, and follows a consistent processes. It integrates program review, resource allocation, strategic and operational plans, and other elements. And it addresses short- and long-term needs of the institution. **Evidence**		
6. eLumen Update	Corey Marvin	• Currently testing workflow 　o Stop Gap • Sarah's building in production site • Banner ID/Course ID- need from Jaime • Goals: 　o Assessment by Spring 　o Training throughout Fall 　　▪ Fall Flex 　　▪ Adjunct Professional Development Day • ILO's are mapped • Roughly about 10 weeks behind		X
7. Updates & Reminders	Corey Marvin	Not discussed at this time.		X
8. Adjourn	Corey Marvin	3:48 p.m.		X

Facilitator: <u>Corey Marvin</u>　　　　　　Recorder: <u>Stephanie Brantley</u>　　　　　　**O** Open/**C** Closed