



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2020 - 1:00 PM, CI 172
MINUTES

Members Present: Abbie Perry, Lisa Chavez, Ruben Agus, Alice Mecom, Rowena Mendoza, Grant Linsell, Juana Mora, Caroline Durdella, Lisa Sandoval

Members Not Present Alyson Cartagena, Jim Newman, Julio Flores

Guest: Sarah Cote

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	FOLLOW UP
I. Welcome	Caroline chaired the meeting. The meeting opened at 1:05pm.	
II. Review of Minutes	Minutes from last IEC meeting were reviewed, one correction suggested by Abbie.	
III. Educational and Facilities Master Plan	<p>Caroline provided dates for upcoming events.</p> <p>Mission Vision, and Values Summit scheduled on February 28, 2020.</p> <p>Campus forums sessions scheduled on March 9 and 11, 2020</p> <p>Caroline is working with the Educational Master Plan consultant, Diane, on enrollment projection, facilities plan, and prioritization of campus needs.</p>	
IV. Program Review and Annual Planning	<p>Caroline provided draft copies of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Institutional Recommendations and 2) Technical and Process Recommendations <p>from the Program Review process.</p> <p>Not yet included is the recommendation that faculty position identification and ranking occur in the fall semester.</p> <p>In order to improve campus engagement with the planning data, Caroline requested for IEC review Tableau visualizations and provide recommendations at the February 25, 2020 meeting.</p>	



V. Planning Retreat 2020	The 2020 Planning Retreat is scheduled for April 10. Invitations will be distributed soon.	
VI. Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 1:50pm. Next IEC meeting is scheduled for February 25, 2020.	



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	<p>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.</p> <p>Alyson reported that the statements were read at the Outcomes Committee meeting and everyone was pleased with both drafts.</p> <p>The committee came to a consensus to move this to PFC.</p>	Move Vision and Values Statements forward to PFC.
IV. Program Review Institutional Recommendations	<p>Caroline reported that the Fall 2020 Program Review Institutional Recommendations (available on BoardDocs) is what was synthesized from the Program Review process this year.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p>	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,

	<p>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.</p> <p>Caroline reported that successful course completion this year jumped to 81%, that has to do with the EWs.</p> <p>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%.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For associate degrees, the committee decided to make 2200 the set standard and 2480 (2200+280) for the aspirational standard.</p> <p>For bachelor degrees, the committee decided to roll over the standards: 12 for the set standard and 15 (stretch) for the aspirational standard.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For licensure pass rates and the employment rate, the committee will consider those next time, before moving it forward to PFC.</p>	
<p>VI. ACCJC Annual Report</p>	<p>Moved for discussion at the following meeting.</p>	
<p>VII. Continue Template Discussion</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Discuss Kevin Smith's OER feedback with the co-chair of PR, Marie Eckstrom.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>Caroline said that they should at least comment on any activities with respect to open educational resources as a discipline.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The committee will finish the discussion on the templates at the next meeting.</p>	
<p>VIII. Adjourn</p>	<p>Regarding the OER and the cultural relevant pedagogy practices, Julio reported that Kevin Smith will meet with the senate executive board.</p> <p>Alyson asked if it needs to be linked to the close the loop docs.</p> <p>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't give us a different submission: how can this be done so that it is sustainable?</p> <p>Alyson asked: who do we want to have involved? Do we want all faculty input?</p> <p>The planning retreat will also be reviewed next time.</p>	

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



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 Tuesday, March 23, 2021 - 1:00pm, Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Members Present: Caroline Durdella, Alyson Cartagena, Alice Mecom, Julio Flores, Juana Mora, Grant Linsell, Aditi Sapra, Lisa Chavez

Members not present: Ruben Agus (excused), Lisa Sandoval, Marie Eckstrom, Rowena Mendoza

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 3/9/21	There were no comments/corrections to the previous minutes.	
III. ACCJC Annual Report	<p>Caroline reported that the data has undergone changes after the student success metrics dashboard was updated recently. The highlighted items that changed involve certificates and transfer. The awards changed, and the number was updated using the same methodology. For associate degrees, the standard is 2200, and the aspirational is 2200 plus 280, based on recent averages and consideration of enrollment losses.</p> <p>Because the standard is 2200, and for the last two years, it has been 2300, Caroline asked the committee if everyone would like to continue with this, given the last two years?</p> <p>Alice Mecom responded that the assumption is fewer students, fewer degrees.</p> <p>Lisa Chavez asked: last year this was stable, and this year there was a decline?</p> <p>Caroline responded that we went down a little bit. In 18-19 we were at 2392, and in 19-20 it was 2383.</p> <p>For associate degrees, the committee agreed leave it the same, and Caroline updated the</p>	Submit to ACCJC.

	<p>rationale: enrollment losses due to stop outs from the pandemic.</p> <p>For bachelor degrees, they were left the same. For transfer, the numbers were two years in the rear on the student success metric dashboard. The last number is 1360, from 18-19. For 19-20, the 18-19 actual was multiplied by 5%, resulting in 1429, and the aspirational is 1429 plus one standard deviation, resulting in 1521. The committee agreed to maintain these as listed.</p> <p>For licensure pass rate and employment rate, Caroline reported reaching out to the deans of these areas: Catherine Page, Mark Yokoyama, Mike Slavich, and Adam Wetsman. Caroline calculated the institutional set standard as the four-year average, and then the aspirational standard is the four-year average, plus one standard-deviation. Caroline recommended that the committee adopt the employment rates presented, based on the approval of the deans consulted.</p> <p>No questions or objections presented by the committee.</p> <p>Caroline reported that this will be submitted to ACCJC.</p>	
<p>IV. Continue Template Discussion</p>	<p>Caroline reported a summary of the changes the committee wants to recommend. First, in the program planning template, look at the disproportionately impacted groups in the data analysis section. Second, retain the program progress section and provide more explicit instructions about what should be seen in that section. Third, post a link to the online outcomes form on the Taskstream program plan template. Lastly, and fourth, Caroline reported that she will seek guidance on how to better elaborate the directions for the resource allocation component, in order to be more descriptive and avoid conflicting approaches regarding entries. This will be added to the guidebook and to the directions on the template.</p> <p>Alyson Cartagena reported that the Outcomes Committee has not yet decided to move forward with the online form. The Outcomes Committee did not vote on this item in the last meeting. It has not yet been officially voted or sent to the senate yet. This would occur on the next meeting, Alyson reported.</p>	<p>Seek guidance on how to better elaborate the directions for the resource allocation component, in order to be more descriptive and avoid conflicting approaches regarding entries. Add to the guidebook and to the directions on the template.</p> <p>Target bringing these recommendations to the first May meeting of PFC.</p> <p>Reach out to Kevin to find out exactly what was decided regarding OER and culturally responsive pedagogy.</p>

	<p>Caroline responded to target bringing these recommendations to the first May meeting of PFC. This will give everyone time to sit with the recommendations, and if something arises, it can be revised.</p> <p>The last thing that went to senate, Caroline reported, is the Open Education Resources and the culturally responsive pedagogy in Program Review. This went to the senate, and there was support for it. Caroline continued that after going to the senate, there was still confusion about the implementation of this, so it is expected to be in Program Review. Caroline will get more information by reaching out to Kevin to find out exactly what was decided. This will be a change, Caroline reported, that goes into Program Review, the Program Review template. It will either be a section or an elaboration of an existing section, specific to open education resources or materials costs and culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy. Caroline will get clarification on which is which.</p> <p>Caroline asked the committee if there is interest in going through the templates more or are the changes satisfactorily to recommend for next year?</p> <p>Members of the committee responded with approval and with liking the incremental approach.</p>	
<p>V. Program Review Institutional Recommendations</p>	<p>Caroline reported that, along with Marie, they reviewed the notes from Program Review. The item being reconsidered is for Software Support. Caroline reported that they did not find any comments related to the recommendation being for software, versus infrastructure, brought up by Ruben Agus previously. Because no recommendation was found, the recommendations will be left the same, because the recommendations have to come from the committee. Caroline and Marie have made a note of this and will pass this along to Gary.</p> <p>At this point, Caroline reported that they are ready to move the Program Review Institutional Recommendations and the ACCJC Institutional Standards forward to PFC.</p>	<p>Pass this along to Gary.</p> <p>Move the Program Review Institutional Recommendations and the ACCJC Institutional Standards forward to PFC.</p>
<p>VI. Adjourn</p>	<p>Caroline announced that in the next meeting the committee will go over the planning retreat agenda and get input from everyone.</p> <p>Previously, this was discussed with Alice and Alyson because the institutional learning outcomes assessment was discussed, and they want to ensure that there is a spot on the planning retreat agenda for this, for accreditation.</p>	<p>Go over the planning retreat agenda and get input from everyone at the next meeting.</p> <p>Look at the most current equity data with Jim.</p>

In April, Caroline continued, the committee will be returning to strategic planning. Caroline and Sarah have taken all the input from the retreat, and through IEC, and putting that into goal-format and objective-format, and moving the activities suggested under each area. Caroline will revisit this in April, after returning from spring break.

Juana mentioned that maybe the committee will want to consider looking at the most current equity data. Maybe the committee can pull in Jim, Juana continued, to go through that because he did a really good job putting together what will be presented to the board.

The next IEC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 13, 2021, at 1:00pm. Meeting adjourned at 1:28pm.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 Tuesday, April 13, 2021 - 1:00pm, Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Members Present: Caroline Durdella, Julio Flores, Rowena Mendoza, Grant Linsell, Ruben Agus, Alice Mecom, Juana Mora, Lisa Chavez

Members not present: Aditi Sapra (excused), Lisa Sandoval, Alyson Cartagena (excused), Marie Eckstrom

Guest: Sarah Cote, James Sass

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 3/23/21	There were no comments/corrections to the previous minutes.	
III. Equity Data Report	<p>James provided an update on Equity Metrics, with reference to the numbers Ceci and Juana recently used in a presentation to the board. Institutions in California, like Rio Hondo, are ahead of the curve, James continued, on how data is reported on equity. During the webinar From Equity Talk to Equity Walk last week, the field was addressed on how many places are using white students as the standard, whereas California institutions are using the average.</p> <p>Two takeaway items from this reporting, James continued: when working with small numbers, sometimes a lot of percentages can change dramatically. Also, when working with small numbers, they matter to the people involved. They may not show up in statistics or be that statistically important, but they matter to those people.</p> <p>For Fall-to-Spring Retention, James reported, inclusive of students who are enrolled in the college in Fall and came back in Spring, for RHC overall, the chancellor's office amount was 65.9% because the chancellor's office could not be replicated, or they do not offer a new version today. For the percentage of Fall students who return, of all 2017 students who return in Spring of 2018, it was 66.9%. The college had an aspirational goal of 69%, and in 19-20, we had 66.8%, so virtually no change.</p>	

Where change can be seen is with some of the other groups; black females have an increase of about 6 points. Black males have a decrease of about 8 points. In each of these cases, the data is still below the aspirational goal. White students stayed about the same, and veteran males are in a good place, above the aspirational goal. For meeting the English and math requirements, passing transfer level English and math in the first year of college, there are big changes across the campus. Two years prior, there was 6.0% of students who in their first year at the college passed both transfer level math and English.

IEC set a goal of 12%, and the actual for 19-20, was 12.5%, exceeding the aspirational goal. There were good increases elsewhere: foster youth females increased substantially; though small in numbers. There was an increase with the foster youth males. There was a big increase, almost double increase, with Latino males, coming near the aspirational goal. With DSPS males, a small increase with males receiving DSPS services. A place to note is with black males: there were none who made it two years ago and none who completed both transfer level math and English last year.

For the Vision Completion, and that includes percentages of students earning a bachelor's degree and associate's degree, or chancellor approved certificate during that year, we see overall for the college it was fairly flat. We do not see a lot of changes, although we see growth with black male students. We do see a good increase with LGBT females. Some of these groups, we are seeing at or above the aspirational goal, and some are below the aspirational goal. For the percentage of students that transferred to a four-year school, we are seeing a very small decrease from 10.5% to 11.6%, basically flat. We are seeing again a small increase among Latino males, who are above the aspirational goal that was set two years ago, based on data from the chancellor's office. These could increase a little by June because we do not have all the enrollments for 2020-2021 as of yet.

Caroline underscored the different data sources, particularly on the transfer measure: previously the chancellor's office data was used. It was not used this time because it was not updated,

	<p>available, and there was not a lot of confidence in it two years ago because schools were not able to replicate it. The goal for transfer, in 21-22, is based on the chancellor's office data, so if it were based on internal data, the college would have a higher target.</p> <p>Alice Mecom asked, is it a weird fluke, from the data presented, that students who take math and English in the same semester do better than those who take one or the other? James responded that this data was in the report and that the fact that students select their own classes should be considered, along with the additional analysis needed for more information.</p> <p>Juana said that she is excited about the potential expansion of RTLI because then students could be better supported to exceed the success rate.</p> <p>On the Black Scholars Initiative, Juana said that Dr. Devin Graves is in the process of conducting focus groups with the black students on campus.</p>	
<p>IV. ILO Report</p>	<p>Caroline, on behalf of Alyson, said that Alyson will present this at PFC today. Caroline reported that IEC is at the point where ILOs need to be assessed.</p> <p>The outcomes committee assessed ILOs a couple of meetings ago and came up with findings and recommendations based on the data that IRP provided from Taskstream. The main recommendations, listed on page 5, show a theme.</p> <p>The main recommendation, with regards to learning, is that improvements with outcomes on demonstrate the abilities to use mathematics are needed. This ILO had the lowest proficiency rate, according to the data on Taskstream.</p> <p>The other recommendations that came through will likely come to IEC, directly related to establishing proficiency standards for the ILOS, similar to ACCJC, as in establishing an institutional set standard, as well as an aspirational set standard for the ILOs.</p> <p>Other things that came through were to continue to invest in programs and resources that have influenced high proficiency rates in ILO area 5, develop personal and career goals, specifically utilizing college resources to support educational goals (directly linked to Guided Pathways efforts and maintaining and improving personal health, wellness, and performance).</p>	<p>This will probably come back to IEC next semester to work with the outcomes committee in establishing institutional and aspirational standards for the ILOs.</p>

	<p>Another recommendation is to work in collaboration with division deans, faculty, IRP, and the outcomes coordinator to ensure that all new courses are mapped.</p> <p>The ILO report, Caroline continued, is part of the comprehensive planning process and is scheduled every three years.</p> <p>Once the recommendations come out, then it becomes an effort to develop strategies to improve those ILOs, and then when reassessment takes place, improvements must be identified. This will probably come back to IEC next semester to work with the outcomes committee in establishing institutional and aspirational standards for the ILOs.</p>	
<p>V. ACCJC Annual Report</p>	<p>Caroline reported that the ACCJC Annual Report looked at our course completion rate because ACCJC asks us to set our institution set standard. The stretch goal, or aspirational standard, is included, as well, along with the actual success rates.</p> <p>The entries were viewed as a team, through the committee work, looking at the actual in order to be taken into consideration in setting the institutional and the aspirational. The information is the same for certificates: the institution, the floor, the aspirational, and the actual.</p> <p>Caroline reports that we are doing really well because the standards were set somewhat conservatively, right along with the institutional set standards and the aspirational standards.</p>	
<p>VI. Planning Retreat Agenda</p>	<p>Caroline reported that she has started to draft the agenda, with an 8:30am start, till 12:30pm. The day begins with an agenda overview and goals for the day. Then all the reports are next: planning and program review updates, program review-institutional recommendations, outcomes assessment, and resource allocation. The reason these reports are presented is because of Standard I of the accreditation ISER.</p> <p>An accreditation update will follow, Caroline continued, along with an update on comprehensive planning providing details on finishing the Mission, Vision and Values Statements. Next is Strategic Planning Synthesis, Strategic Goals and Objectives, and, lastly, three-year activities and process owners. Equity Report was added to the agenda, before Outcomes Assessment.</p> <p>The agenda will be brought back, before the Planning Retreat, at the next IEC meeting.</p>	<p>The agenda will be brought back, before the Planning Retreat, at the next IEC meeting.</p>

VII. Finalize Template Recommendations	Caroline will reach out to Academic Senate to find out the recommendation, in order to discuss at the next meeting.	Reach out to Academic Senate to find out the recommendation, in order to discuss at the next meeting.
VIII. Strategic Plan Update (as time permits)	<p>Last Fall IEC engaged in developing themes, brainstormed activities and goals for Strategic Planning. Caroline reported that, along with Sarah, this information has been reworked and placed into goals and numerical, quantifiable objectives, and items have been moved into the activities space. The themes, previously discussed, have been moved into a grid, as part of step 1. This information was then changed into a strategic planning format. This will be the majority of the work for the planning retreat of 2021-22 to 2027-28.</p> <p>Caroline also provided an overview of the goals. Goal 1: increase student completion and employment. Goal 2: increase access FTES and enrollment efficiency. Goal 3: increase faculty and staff understanding of Institutional effectiveness and implementation of equity-minded practices. Goal 4: improve physical spaces and increase sustainability, energy conservation, and safety. Goal 5: increase productivity and efficiency through state-of-the-art information systems and platforms.</p> <p>Discipline focused (math), on completion, amended to Goal 1.</p> <p>Goal 3 is amended with <i>accountability</i> after <i>Increase faculty and staff understanding</i>. Under objectives, the addition of <i>3.2 increase equity minded practices, staff</i> is included.</p> <p>Caroline detailed that people will be separated into groups, by goal, so that feedback can be provided on this, and synthesize more items over the summer.</p> <p>For Goal 2, Julio said to include a description: when presenting on the items of accountability, versus understanding, the committee describes what is meant by that goal.</p>	Caroline and Sarah will continue developing the objectives and activities. Caroline will plan to send out an update in a week, so that committee members can look at it before the next meeting, and before the planning retreat. Alice will look into enrollment management.
IX. Adjourn	In regard to Strategic Planning implementations, before adjourning Caroline reported that, along with Sarah, they will discuss how this will be set up in Taskstream to facilitate reporting on an annual basis.	Caroline and Sarah will discuss how Strategic Planning implementations will be set up in Taskstream to

The next IEC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 27, 2021, at 1:00pm. Meeting adjourned at 2:06pm.

facilitate reporting on an annual basis.



Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 Tuesday, April 27, 2021 - 1:00pm, Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Members Present: Caroline Durdella, Juana Mora, Lisa Chavez, Julio Flores, Rowena Mendoza, Ruben Agus, Grant Linsell, Alice Mecom, Alyson Cartagena, Lisa Sandoval

Members not present: Aditi Sapra, Marie Eckstrom

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 4/13/21	There were no comments/corrections to the previous minutes.	
III. Goals & Objectives	<p>Julio reported on the IEC accomplishments for AY 2020-2021.</p> <p>IEC, Julio reported, was able to complete the following: draft and approve the Vision Statement, draft and approve the Values Statement (not available on the website), hosted three Strategic Planning Retreats, drafted the Strategic Plan for 2021-2028, worked on the ACCJC Institutional Set Standards (recently adopted), completed the RISC Survey, obtained data on the campus environment/climate, submitted to the ASPEN California Community College Trustee Fellowship Project, completed the review of the planning and program review templates (with a continued integration of equity metrics and analysis with program review and planning processes), completed program review recommendations, and currently finishing the evaluations of the institutional level outcomes.</p>	
IV. Retreat Agenda	<p>Caroline presented the draft of the retreat agenda.</p> <p>First, an overview of the agenda, along with the goals for the day will be presented. To begin, next are the Institutional Effectiveness Reports: planning and program review updates by Julio, program review-institutional recommendations by Marie, equity metrics-progress report by Cecilia, outcomes assessment-institutional learning outcomes by Alyson, and guided pathways update by Lydia.</p>	

	<p>The next component is the accreditation update by Marie and Caroline.</p> <p>After a break, there is a review of comprehensive planning, along with a review of the mission, vision, and values statements and a review of the strategic planning process. Before the next break is a presentation of the strategic planning synthesis.</p> <p>The following time is dedicated to activities on strategic goals, strategic objectives, and three-year activities with process owners.</p> <p>The next steps, from the information gathered from the activities, are to synthesize the information and IEC will finalize a recommendation on the goals, objectives, and activities and get those approved in early fall of 2021, and then IEC will have its strategic plan to begin its implementation.</p>	
V. Adjourn	<p>The next IEC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 1:00pm. Meeting adjourned at 1:28pm.</p>	