

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL MEETING (Friday, November 3, 2017)

Generated by Andrea R Pulido on Tuesday, November 14, 2017

Members present

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

Meeting called to order at 12:29 PM

1. Call Meeting to Order

1.1 By: S. Shepard @ 12:29pm

2. Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

2.1 Minutes May 15, 2017

Approval

Motion by Anita Bart, second by Matthew Magnuson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Jeffrey Wanderer, Francisco Banuelos, Mark Matteson, Robert Pimentel, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson

2.2 Minutes September 27, 2017

Approval

Motion by Jeffrey Wanderer, second by Arkady Hanjiev.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Jeffrey Wanderer, Francisco Banuelos, Mark Matteson, Robert Pimentel, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson

2.3 Minutes October 20, 2017

Approve w/Changes

- M. Magnuson was present and needs to added to the agenda

Motion by Anita Bart, second by Jeffrey Wanderer.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Jeffrey Wanderer, Francisco Banuelos, Mark Matteson, Robert Pimentel, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson

3. CVHEC Regional Coordinator

3.1 Virginia ... Introduction

- Virginia gave a brief background of her role in CVHEC

- CVHEC - Central Valley Higher Education Consortium. The board makes decisions to help facilitate colleges.

4. Institutional Research Update

4.1 K. Crider Department Update

- S. Shepard said that she was under the impression that K. Crider was going to return to this meeting to finish the learning updates. It doesn't appear that K. Crider was aware that he was supposed to show up at this meeting today.
- S. Shepard was discussing the new form that was released. She asked if we want K. Crider return to do another presentation, or if we feel that we can train the rest of the college on this topic? M. Gritton, J. Wanderer, and A. Pulido think that K. Crider should be present at every meeting.
- S. Shepard would like K. Crider to be a standing member of this committee to make sure that the decisions made on the campus are shared with the DO and vice versus.
- S. Shepard said that the new form has a place for the stretch goal. She would like K. Crider to be apart of the dialog to discuss how this stretch goal works and how it applies to us.
- S. Shepard will attach the new form to the agenda. This new form is much more involved and requires a great deal of analysis and more comprehensive than a few years ago.
- R. Pimentel said that he will be able to complete the Job Placement Rate, but the data that comes in is in Batch data. Pulling individual based data is difficult to do, based on the reports currently available. B. Thames would like this data to match what is reported for gainful employment (this report comes through financial aid - then comes through office of ed).
- B. Thames feels that any report leaving this college should run through this governance body. S. Shepard agrees with this.
- Many places on the new form is district information and S. Shepard feels that although the college is reporting, many of the items are actually District controlled items.
- This will be added to the next agenda and we need to devise a plan on how we are going to educate the rest of the campus.
- B. Thames mentioned that the college in Monterey was sanctioned due to not knowing about this data. We need to be ahead of this.
- J. Wanderer asked who completes this form - the answer was this body does. S. Shepard said that this is why we need to map this process out. Some of this information needs to run through Senate. J. Wanderer asked if this is certified, how do we determine if this is correct data, etc. Does this get Board Approval???
- There was discussion about where the previous ones are housed. On the web.
- J. Wanderer said that it would be helpful to add links to the data results.

5. Institutional Effectiveness Learning Area Reports

5.1 K. Crider report out

- Will work with K. Crider for this

6. Guided Pathways Self-Assessment

6.1 S. Shepard report out

- S. Shepard added this to share with this group. This is the document that includes the responses from the survey, the College Council meeting.
- F. Banuelos said that there are some formatting issues, but this will be cleaned up.
- F. Banuelos said that this will be the document that will be voted on by College Council.
- S. Shepard asked if this should be voted on by IEAC. B. Thames feels that this committee should vote on it so that we can move it forward to College Council and then the Board.

- S. Shepard asked if the due date is still December 23rd? It has to be approved by the board.
- B. Felix-Mata said that it appears that most of the data on here is quantitative, She is concerned about this needing documentation. B. Thames explained that this is not a test, and that there are not really any good or bad answers, it is used as a tool to assess whether the college has done any true thinking about these items prior to receiving funding.
- This is something that the Core group does the work on, but that it coming through this committee as a way to document its process and what is taking place.
- M. Gritton said that it is important to have this as a standing item to continue down the path of intergraded planning and being a better institution.
- S. Shepard mentioned that the feedback from President's Forum was very valuable.
- F. Banuelos feels that the more people that complete the survey, it will go out to the task group, and continue to be evaluated and then brought back to this council.
- B. Thames said that we can continue to send this out annually to use it as a benchmark to determine how we are growing.
- This survey will be sent back out and the email will include the time it takes to complete it.
- A. Hanjiev asked who will take ownership of this survey and it's results and who will be taking charge of the entire Guided Pathways process. S. Shepard said that IEAC will be the over all Committee that the Guided Pathway group reports to.
- J. Wanderer mentioned that we need to formally create this Guided Pathway Task Force and have it be a subgroup of this committee:
- The Guided Pathways Membership - S. Shepard, J. Bonds, S. Wilson, R. Pimentel, F. Banuelos, B. Thames, M. Gritton, M. Magnuson, A. Hanjiev, B. Felix-Mata, J. Wanderer

Approval

Motion by Jeffrey Wanderer, second by Mark Gritton

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Jeffrey Wanderer, Francisco Banuelos, Mark Matteson, Robert Pimentel, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson

7. Mission and Website Updates

7.1 S. Shepard follow up report

- S. Shepard will continue to work on getting the mission's cleaned up.
- S. Shepard did clean up the portal site and will add the Guided Pathway Task Group
- S. Shepard discussed the templates for the 6 recommendations for compliance. These templates are on the portal page. She put the Responsible Party based on what the President Presented at Flex Day in the fall. These templates need to be taken to the responsible party and then worked on.
- S. Shepard said that she will have the other remaining templates up by the next meeting.
- The deadline needs to be closer to April/May 2018. We need to start documenting what we are already doing. S. Shepard said that we already have much of this in progress.
- These forms are workable and will do the job we need.
- A. Bart said that she thinks that we give some recommendations that the groups can follow to help complete the forms and give them direction.
- A. Bart said that we need training on how do we document stuff so that it can be used as evidence.
- The AOL will be setting up in service workshops for how to document evidence

- The deadline to return to this committee was added to the templates. "IEAC READ: April 2, 2018"

8. Outcomes Update for Follow Up Report

8.1 A. Hanjiev Review and Update

- A. Hanjiev went back through the last accreditation - He spoke about how other schools do this. He reviewed 3 other colleges that passed Accreditation.
- They do not have it in their KPI's but they do have a great deal of discussion about it. He reviewed how this was completed by each of the colleges he researched.
- A. Pulido asked if A. Hanjiev could send his report out to her to add to the agenda and his explanation.
- He felt that the last college did a good job with how they documented it. The bubble up process from one committee to the next committee is an important step to capture.
- S. Shepard stated that the comments about documentation training will be helpful. She also said that minutes need to be taken better by all support staff. That they must be more robust and have a more of template approach and uniformity to how minutes are taken.
- There was discussion about how this process is trying to be addressed with secretary meetings and how this will take place.
- S. Shepard stated that she just wants more robust minutes, regardless of how it happens.

9. WHCC Follow-Up Report

9.1 ACCJC Follow Up Report Manual - Table

10. Flex and Duty Day Follow Up

10.1 Survey Results

11. Governance Manual Sub-Committee Report Out

11.1 Committee Proposed Template - Table

12. IEAC Goals

12.1 Review and Update - Table

13. Next Meeting:

13.1 Date/Time: November 17, 2017 @ 11am

14. Adjournment

14.1 By: S. Shepard @ 2:03pm

14.2 Minutes Taken By: A. Pulido