

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & ACCREDITATION COUNCIL MEETING (Friday, April 13, 2018)

Generated by Andrea R Pulido on Friday, April 13, 2018

Members present

Sarah Shepard, Arkady Hanjiev, Andrea R Pulido, Bertha Felix Mata, Mark Gritton, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson, Nicholas Andrews, Mark Matteson, Eric A Mendoza

Meeting called to order at 11:07 AM**1. Call Meeting to Order**

1.1 By: S. Shepard @ 11:07am

1.2 Changes to the Agenda - None

2. Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

2.1 April 9, 2018 Minutes

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, Anita Bart, Matthew Magnuson, Mark Matteson, Eric A Mendoza

3. Institutional Effectiveness

3.1 IR Department Update - Crider

- No update at this time

3.2 WHCC Website Governance - Shepard

- Waiting for update from Kyle

3.3 Standard Assignments - Shepard

- None

3.4 Annual Committee Review - Shepard

- Will attempt to get the surveys out today or Monday morning

4. Accreditation Follow-Up Report

4.1 Follow Up Report Draft 3

Recommendation #09:

- During the Outcomes committee meeting on Wednesday, M. Matteson and R. Pimentel reviewed #9 and there have been comments and updates sent in to further update the narrative.
- S. Shepard asked if the narrative analysis for number 9 is done by the recommendation order, or is it all over and in no particular order. They are not in order.
- S. Shepard asked if we want to review the notes that F. Banuelos sent this morning - A. Hanjiev asked if these are notes that F. Banuelos did himself, or what are they. We are not sure because there was not a lot of explanation about them.
- A. Hanjiev gave some explanation regarding his narrative for number 9.
- There was discussion about the prioritization of Program Review items happening in Budget Committee.
- S. Shepard would like the narrative in Paragraph 3 to explain when it was first used, when college council reviewed it, and when we first used it.
- There was discussion regarding the evidence and where we can get it and use it to illustrate the integration of Program Review and Budget Committee.
- Discussed changing the Program Review template to show the closing of the loop on how to tie the outcomes of funding. A. Hanjiev said that at other colleges they update their templates annually at the end of the year and then start the next year with the new template. The committee discussed that this will work well for us - M. Magnuson said that we have not done this and it will be helpful to incorporate this as a standing item on the end of the year agenda.
- S. Shepard said that she feels that this is circular and it would be better to separate this by recommendation component. S. Shepard mentioned that she thought #9 was originally done this way.
- S. Shepard said that other college have written their follow up reports by breaking them out to make it clear what they are addressing.
- There was discussion about using the first sentence as a way to reference the recommendation portion. S. Shepard would like it to be notated above as well.
- There was discussion regarding splitting everything up and then this will allow for more robust narrative to come in under each item.
- A. Hanjiev mentioned that he will be meeting with R. Pimentel to add information about Adjunct Faculty and Budget. This will be taking place on Monday.
- N. Andrews joined the meeting.
- M. Matteson said that his comments were mainly about the program review cycle and what programs we have completed and also about the template.
- S. Shepard mentioned that the feedback from Steve has not been incorporated into the document at this time.

- A discussion took place about focusing on answering the recommendations based only on actions since the visit and not on any past actions that took place and then to be sure to look at the sustainability.

Recommendation #10:

- The comments that Steve made have not been incorporated into the document
- The percentages will need to be updated to include the correct percentages because the matrixes have been updated.
- S. Shepard mentioned that the recommendation only discusses the Syllabi and the CORs having SLO data and that the narrative about the CORs needs to be beefed up.
- There was discussion about making sure to use the correct tense when writing the document.
- M. Magnuson said that it will be a good idea to add a review of the syllabus percentages for SLO data at IEAC so that the Office of Education has a place to report out this information and that we are sustainable.
- The committee discussed having this take place at the end of each term.
- There was discussion about the evidence being included in the narrative and not at the end. This evidence should be included in the same manner as the ISER.
- There was discussion about writing about processes that are not taking place at this time, and needing to be sure to have "wide spread" dialog about things like Learning Area Deans reviewing syllabi.
- There was further dialog about this being completely new information regarding Learning Area Deans being responsible for any type of ongoing responsibilities including their responsibilities that may including hiring adjuncts, scheduling, evaluations, etc. This really should be a wide spread dialog and should be reflected in other governance committee meetings before anything is written in the follow up report.
- There was editing to the draft to reflect the comments made by Steve and also the recommendations of the committee.

Recommendation #12:

- The committee ran out of time.
- A. Pulido mentioned that President Thames will be working on getting more information in the IEAC Portal to provide the documentation and also what the processes are and the decisions that were made in Chancellors Executive Cabinet Driving this process.

Other Discussion:

- The decision was made to add these notes on the follow up report and place it back to the portal. S. Shepard will let F. Banuelos regarding this.

- S. Shepard discussed that compliance items #2, 4, and 14 have not been drafted, but that the templates for these recommendations are completed.
- There was a look at the timeline.
- There was a discussion regarding sending the college council calendar invite to the IEAC committee to attend to get as much information about the feedback.

5. Next Meeting:

5.1 Date/Time - 4/27/18 @ 11:30am

6. Adjournment

6.1 By: @ 12:45pm by S. Shepard

6.2 Minutes Taken By: A. Pulido