

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL MEETING (Wednesday, September 13, 2017)

Generated by Andrea R Pulido on Sunday, September 17, 2017

Members present

Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Jeffrey Wanderer, Francisco Banuelos, Mark Matteson, Robert Pimentel

Others present

Brenda Thames

Meeting called to order at 12:08 PM

1. Call Meeting to Order

By: S. Shepard @ 12:08pm

2. Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

2.1 Minutes May 1, 2017

Table

3. Commission Report Review

3.1 Information regarding direction we are taking

- S. Shepard discussed that we have compliance issues that have a October 18th deadline for submission of corrections.
- A question was asked regarding if the OFE's need to be updated by the October 18th deadline as well? 2 OFE's institutional effectiveness and pathways. S. Shepard will update them and get them on the portal site.
- B. Thames asked if everyone was up to date on the recommendations? A. Hanjiev asked if the visit is in the spring? The report is due October 18th - but the writing is due in August because the Board needs to approve and have 2 reads, one reading August and one in September. A. Hanjiev asked if we can update them with progress made after the report October 18th. B. Thames said that we plan to submit an addendum to the visiting team with new evidence after the visit, but she would like this information projected in the report itself.
- S. Shepard asked if there is a team responsible for this process. B. Thames asked the attached presentation document that she constructed works for everyone? If it does then we can go off of what she started with.
- At the forum it was suggested that F. Banuelos and S. Shepard will co-chair this committee. They accepted these roles.

4. WHCC Recommendations Review

4.1 Review and Update

5. WHCC Response Action Plan Review

5.1 Review and Update

- Committee reviewed the President Forum Presentation for recommended plan of action.
- College Planning Council is were the ISS lives. CPC will be working on institutional set standards - help from K. Crider.
- All institutional stuff needs to remain in CPC, per S. Shepard and B. Thames... This is recommendation 4.

- Recommendation 9 - will be in Outcomes Committees - The SLO committee actually exists. The others only have a coordinator and M. Matteson suggested looking into turning the others into committee's as well. A. Hanjiev said that due to student outcome learning both SLO and Outcomes committee should both be in there.
- There was a question about the first bullet in this recommendation - and B. Thames explained her evaluation of what this meant. It goes from Course to institutional and course to program. Statewide mapping looks like courses are tied to both as well. It should not be course to institutional to program. Data will be lost if we did it this way. The institutional link should be linked to outcomes driving the process of everything.
- What are our measurements of institutional effectiveness - then go back and see what we can pick up for outcomes. How many were made, completed and then went back out - closing the loop. Student Learning is only a component, it is not driving the process. Closing the loop will be an indicator to this. B. Thames feels that closing the loop is more of a process. Through KPI's how ISLO's closed the loop, dig down one level and see the evidence of the data to show what happened.
- KPI's is how we assess, the strategic plan is the measurement. B. Thames said that we were not able to demonstrate to the team how we are including Student Learning Outcomes.
- There was a brainstorming session about how we are going to include all of the evidence to answer this question. J. Wanderer asked what other colleges are doing to address this. A. Hanjiev said that he would research that.
- Rolling cycle of SLO's does not give any really good data. A. Hanjiev feels that what improvements have been made, and how it was done is more important. He feels that this is attainable data. Improvement is what we need to show, because successful SLO's does not mean that the students are actually successful in the class.
- We don't have student learning in the KPI's, we have Student Success in the KPI. Achievement is through completion rates. 1b1 was referenced.
- If we drill down into course level it will be easy to get data in a years time. The action plans in the fall will re-access in the spring for cycle 1. Will need to show an analysis of the data and the metrics need to show how many action plans were taken and how many lead to improvement. Out of 7 or 8 actions plans, how many showed improvement - 4, 5?
- Where should we put it in CPC? S. Shepard thinks that this new metric can be presented at CPC annually. The course level map directly to institutional - report on all levels to CPC? ISLO's should cover it since they are all mapped. There can also be an annual PSLO's and ISLO's - the ISLO's are done every 4 years. Take 4 years worth of data out of SharePoint and then assess it. What about doing a 2 year midterm. Canvas eLumen integration.
- J. Wanderer thinks that we should be accessing every class every semester, but that is his 2 cents.
- Changing KPI's might be the route to take to this recommendation - we can add this to the current KPI's - strategic plan for our campus is tied to the District KPI's.
- S. Shepard said that she thinks that the college should have their own KPI's and that we might want to develop them at CPC and then alter the strategic plan for our college.
- Being hung up on the work component needs to be looked at in terms of institutional effectiveness. Need to map our own college goals and then tie them to the District Goals and put that into our strategic plan.
- B. Thames would like to review and revise the strategic plan and then add college level goals. As a response to integrated planning we reviewed the strategic plan and added local measurable goals and this will kill 2 birds with one stone.
- B. Thames asked if we can add the most current data to the columns that already exist in the '09 document. A. Hanjiev said that he can do some data crunches and update it.

- Ongoing process, but the data itself is just all over the place. Create a handbook to show the process and then put everything into one place. Can we get a video for process. Is this all going to be up in eLumen. All the accessing should be done in IEAC, and not at CPC.
- Accountability is missing - this council should be able to track the effectiveness of the faculty individual nature.
- Programs need to be assessed for SLO's.. Look at CTE programs every 2 years... There is mapping from courses to Programs in there, but pulling this data was difficult.
- The program review form needs to be altered to include the closing the loop data. You will tie the SLOs to the improvement, you need to have quantitative data. Need workshops and training on how to tie SLOs to Program Reviews.
- M. Gritton created a mock template in eLumen for Program Review. Please have templates for Program Review template, brought to IEAC and then CPC...
- Recommendation 10 needs to be about syllabi review. There was discussion about setting up a drive or some way to drop the syllabi in.
- Recommendation 12 - COR's Faculty will complete a SLO addendum if necessary to comply with this.
- Recommendation = President's office will track faculty evaluations. and create a database for this.
- Two weeks will have an Program Review Template
- Two weeks update about repository for syllabi.
- Create a timeline and assign workgroups to complete some of these tasks. Will address this next meeting.
- Sanction a subcommittee for the co-chairs of the standards. We can see if Anita Bart, Matt Magnuson, and Nick Andrews. We can vote on this item based on the success of getting these people onboard.

6. WHCC Follow-Up Report

6.1 Review and Update

7. WHCC IEAC Membership

7.1 Review and Update

- There was a review of the members for this committee and to see who is going to spearhead the issues for compliance. There was discussion regarding needing more people on this committee.
- Currently we have the following representation: Program Review - Mark Gritton/Mark Matteson, Budget Resources - Robert Pimentel/Mark Gritton, Classified - Andrea Pulido, SSLO - Mark Matteson, Institutional Outcomes - Arkady Hanjiev/Robert Pimentel, Administrative Outcomes - Bertha Felix-Mata, BASE - Robert Pimentel, Chairs - S. Shepard/Francisco Banuelos - AOL

8. IEAC Goals

8.1 Review and Update

9. Governance Manual

9.1 Review and Update

10. Next Meeting:

10.1 WHCC IEAC Meeting Dates/Times/Locations

- Reviewed this item.

11. Adjournment

11.1 By: S. Shepard at 2:09pm

11.2 Minutes Taken By: Andrea Pulido