Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Tuesday, March 9, 2021 - 1:00pm, Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Members Present: Caroline Durdella, Aditi Sapra, Alice Mecom, Alyson Cartagena, Juana Mora, Julio Flores, Lisa Sandoval, Marie Eckstrom, Rowena Mendoza, Ruben Agus, Lisa Chavez, Grant Linsell
Members not present:
Guest: Sarah Cote

Agenda Item	Discussion	Follow Up
I. Welcome	Caroline welcomed those in attendance and opened the meeting at 1:00pm.	
II. Review and Approval of Minutes from 2/23/21	There were no comments/corrections to the previous minutes.	
III. Vision and Values Recommendations	Caroline reported that the Vision and Values Statements have undergone minor changes, based on the findings from the survey. The committee had been asked to go back to their constituencies and discuss this with them to see if there was anything that should be considered, before moving this forward to PFC. Alyson reported that the statements were read at the Outcomes Committee meeting and everyone was pleased with both drafts. The committee came to a consensus to move this to PFC.	Move Vision and Values Statements forward to PFC.
IV. Program Review Institutional Recommendations	Caroline reported that the Fall 2020 Program Review Institutional Recommendations (available on BoardDocs) is what was synthesized from the Program Review process this year. Caroline reported that a couple of the highlights are related to completion: one is to advocate for admissions and records to develop an online graduation petition, also consideration of local degrees, versus ADTs. Regarding outcomes, Caroline reported, that a discussion came through related to the academic pathway programs, related to law, and trying to get a decision about where it should be housed: is it an academic affairs or student services program?	Caroline and Marie will update the PR recommendations before moving them forward.

Additionally, on outcomes, Caroline reported the topic of continuing to offer more opportunities for robust faculty dialogue on closing the loop emerged. Also, better integration of curriculum catalogue and outcomes came from PR.

For IEC, it was reported that the committee should develop and make a recommendation regarding conditions under which programs should strive for improvement and or maintain performance.

For noninstructional outcomes, from last year, noninstructional programs have not been paid a lot of attention with respect to outcomes assessment. Marie reported that outcomes for noninstructional programs have always been a problem in program review. They need guidance and their outcome assessments are very different from academic assessments. Each of the noninstructional operational programs needs assistance.

Alyson reported that right now this position is part-time, and it is really challenging to get everyone through all their close-the-loops and all the curriculum they are trying to do. This is something, Alyson continued, that should be considered long-term.

For professional development, Caroline reported, that understanding of data was something that came out of the review process that probably would involve collaboration between IEC and IRP. IRP does a lot of training; however, it was recommended out of the PR process that IRP expand that training because there was a need for it and the amount of training in the fall was not enough.

Related to enrollment management, Caroline reported that the enrollment management plan should address cancellation of classes and make recommendations regarding appropriate timeframes and situations when classes should be cancelled for low enrollment. There are certain windows, Caroline continued, that other colleges use for that, but she does not know if Rio Hondo College has talked about that formally here. Also, the enrollment management plan should address conditions related to program growth and stabilities.

On instructional operations, Caroline reported creating a master schedule for degrees and certificates.

Alice said that the catalogue has a course frequency chart that the curriculum committee created but she does not know how often it is updated.

Grant said that Mike and Kathy keep this updated, and that Kathy probably has the most current version of this in her office.

Caroline asked Grant if that is accessible to students outside of the print catalog.

Grant responded that we have two versions of our catalog online.

Alice said she does not know if it is printed anywhere, other than the catalog. The thing is, Alice continued, that when new programs are developed someone has to go back and add them.

Lisa said that Mike Slavich will occasionally send that out to all deans to update it.

Caroline and Marie will update the PR recommendations before moving them forward.

For technology, data storage needs of the college and develop the recommendation regarding the electronic storage of data.

Caroline asked the committee for their feedback on the recommendations.

Alice said that in Banner now when you go to the schedule at the very top there is a link that says, "late start classes," and when you click on it, you are able to see, not just the 8 weeks, but anything that begins after the start of the semester, on the online schedule.

On technology and course offerings, Lisa said that there is so much intertwined, especially enrollment management and technology, there is a lot of software out there that is available, even for the educational plans to look to see what types of courses are recommended to students, and from that, to inform how many different courses should be offered. There are limitations in terms of the timeline, Lisa continued; they have gotten better about doing registration earlier. There are technologies out there and more should be included that would allow us to do these things related to enrollment technology and completion.

Caroline said that is coming up with the CARES Projects that they are working on, related to course management, not related to course offerings.

Ruben asked what part of technology is being reviewed this time around, is it the help desk or the infrastructure or the enterprise system?

	Also, Ruben continued, one more addition to what Lisa said: it's a software enterprise review, the recommendations that is written here, from the technology point of view/perspective, it's more into infrastructure needs, instead of software needs. The one that Lisa said, the one that is more into a software enterprise needs, instead of the one that we put down on the paper here. Caroline responded that Gary is starting the process of updating the technology plan, and as part of that process, there is an opportunity for feedback from campus groups. Once that process starts, I will see how I can make everyone on this committee aware of that process in case they want to participate, and provide input into the technology plans (certainly these issues that you bring up Lisa, I would see as part of a tech. plan) that would be another way to get that in. Caroline said that the program that went through review this time around was Software Support. Marie reported that there is no ownership of recommendations and projects and that people are needed to work on some system for project prioritization. Lisa said that from classification, every year, the need for more staff has been requested, along with a job study, after being turned down. Alyson indicated that a plan is needed for what to do with the Chromebooks that are returned from students, for students that do need them. Caroline and Marie will rework the recommendations and bring them back. Caroline reported that if the committee does come to a recommendation that they want to prioritize institutionally, IEC can assign an area manager for assignment.	
V. Institution Set Standards ACCJC	Caroline reported that that Institution Set Standards are required by ACCJC every year. Caroline and Sarah updated the spreadsheet, and one of the things encountered is that the last time this was formally done through IEC was a couple of years ago when it was decided to roll over the standards from the previous year. No data was previously available because the chancellor's office had not updated the student success dashboard. The chancellor's office, Caroline continued, has placed the release of this information on a different schedule. Instead of receiving information in the early spring, we would now get it in the summer,	

	which does not align with the ACCJC process because this is due on April 9. For that reason, the information presented was pieced together from different sites. As a result, the data is not a good match for previous years. In all instances, we do not have any comparison data. Caroline reported that successful course completion this year jumped to 81%, that has to do with the EWs. Regarding the 2020-21 Institution Set Standard, for completion rate, the committee decided to roll over the 2018-19 Institution Set Standard into the 2020-21 year: set standard at 72% and the aspirational standard at 73.65%. For certificates, the committee decided with a two-year average for the floor, for the institution set standard, and the two-year average, plus one standard deviation, for the aspirational standard. For associate degrees, the committee decided to make 2200 the set standard and 2480 (2200+280) for the aspirational standard. For bachelor degrees, the committee decided to roll over the standards: 12 for the set standard and 15 (stretch) for the aspirational standard. For transfer, Caroline recommended that the committee take a lot at the numbers from the student success metrics dashboard in order to project. Caroline reported the four-year average as 1161, with a standard deviation of 25. The committee decided, for transfer, to make 1265 the set standard and 1265, plus the standard deviation, for the aspirational standard. For licensure pass rates and the employment rate, the committee will consider those next time, before moving it forward to PFC.	
VI. ACCJC Annual Report	Moved for discussion at the following meeting.	
VII. Continue Template Discussion	Caroline reported on the summary involving templates from last time. The number one thing was more guidance on resource allocation. The committee talked about adding in data analysis for disproportionately impacted groups, and potentially a section for objectives and action steps for DI groups, posting the link to the electronic closing the loop form. Also, the committee had discussions about a section, or question, on open educational resources. Caroline reported that she talked to Kevin Smith about this earlier. His thought was that we	Discuss Kevin Smith's OER feedback with the co-chair of PR, Marie Eckstrom.

	include this for Program Review. He wants to see a more in-depth analysis on the Program Review side and to ask programs undergoing review to look at the cost of their textbooks, and materials, and write about that in their review.	
	Caroline said that they should at least comment on any activities with respect to open educational resources as a discipline.	
	Kevin also asked that the committee consider a question, in PR, on specific activities related to culturally relevant pedagogy: what is happening in the classroom? what are faculty doing in the classroom that relates to culturally relevant instructional practices?	
	Caroline said that this is another item that we might want to add to the annual plan. The idea is to have the suggestion so that people think about these items and people incorporate them into their activities and becomes part of the college culture and process. We talked about the program process section, making it its own section.	
	The committee will finish the discussion on the templates at the next meeting.	
VIII. Adjourn	Regarding the OER and the cultural relevant pedagogy practices, Julio reported that Kevin Smith will meet with the senate executive board. Alyson asked if it needs to be linked to the close the loop docs. Caroline responded that the committee should talk about ways to best integrate all of those. It's also important to ensure that the committee does not create something that is very onerous that people don not give us a different submission: how can this be done so that it is sustainable? Alyson asked: who do we want to have involved? Do we want all faculty input? The planning retreat will also be reviewed next time.	

	The next IEC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 1:00pm. Meeting adjourned at 2:17pm.	