



Minutes

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Date: Thursday, February 25, 2021

Time: 3:00 pm – 4:30 pm

Location: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/94556596246?pwd=aTRZWlViT3Q3bW1mMmZSUklpb1ZEUT09>

Attendees: Ben Beshwate, Lisa Couch, Cliff Davis, Jaclyn Kessler, Ryan Khamkongsay, Corey Marvin, Jaime McClure, Heather Ostash, Sharlene Paxton, Laura Vasquez, Dawn Ward

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3:01 pm by Corey Marvin

2. Changes/Additions to the Agenda

No changes/additions to the agenda

3. Approval of Minutes and Action Items

Minutes approved unanimously

Action Item Update: Corey reached out to Tyson for student participants and hasn't heard back. Corey will follow up with Tyson

Action Item Update: Data Governance moved to March meeting due to influx of data and research requests

4. Program Review

a. PRC and Area Administrators

The Program Review Committee has run into issues with incomplete program reviews. It was suggested that an administrator review the program review before moving forward. The intention will not be for the administrator to approve or be a co-writer, their role would be to ensure the content has been addressed completely. A second pair of eyes to follow up and check in on the process would be helpful. Jaclyn plans to invite area admin to the workshops to learn more about program review in order to evaluate the document effectively. The Program Review Committee requests administrators be involved in the process. Corey explained that PR historically has been a faculty run process. The goal is to streamline the process to provide consistency no matter who the chair is. In the end, it will be a crisis for the institution if program reviews are not completed. The weakness of the current process is deans have not been involved; Corey would like to see the deans involved with the program review in a support role in order to ensure all components are addressed. Laura believes the chairs should utilize the department faculty as a resource and a part of the process. Chairs are only around for two to four years and program review occurs every five years. Heather suggests adding a section in the document to indicate the author(s). Executive Counsel felt if the PR were shorter, the Academic Senate could scrutinize the document better. Corey requested written expectations about the role administrators would have in regards to program review. Deans have a vested interest and need to play a much higher role in the program review process. Ben encouraged the PRC to get something in writing and the topic will be on the next



Minutes

agenda. The process can be reassessed next year. Dawn is in favor of having admin help to review and welcomes the extra support. Additional trainings may be available to allow authors and department faculty to complete the majority of the document during the trainings. Everyone was in consensus that an area administrator in a supportive role in the program review process would be beneficial.

b. Aligning AUPs and Program Reviews

AUPs should inform Program Review. Heather shared the AUPs align with non-instructional program reviews and asked for clarification of gaps/issues. AUP is department-focused and the program review is program-focused. There is a difference in goals, discussions, and who is involved in discussions. If AUPs are not about the program, then chairs do not have good information to pull from. A few programs are difficult to track their five-year goals where they do not fit into any particular department. There is an accreditation expectation that institutions need to look at our programs more often. Cerro Coso was dinged on not having a process that looks at programs more frequently than every five years. In 2012, the college had two recommendations that PR was not connected to the integrated planning process. Corey provided examples of programs split across departments. Ben inquires why the AUP needs to be aligned with the Program Review. We are responding to the frustration on part of authors. Authors have to revise a document that has not been updated in five years. The processes are distinct and do not build into completion of the program review, which causes consternation on the part of the program review writers. If the AUP aligns better with PR, then the AUP could be used as a track for the PR goals. Dawn suggests elaborating more with the program goal section in the AUP. The accreditation cycle wants a connection that starts with planning and ends with the implementation of resources that then are evaluate. Heather would like to explore the possibility of leveraging the technology we have so the process and documents are not completed manually. Parts of the PR could be auto filled from the AUPs so the work is not so cumbersome. Jaime shared SharePoint workflows and eLumen may be able to meet this need. Dawn suggested canvas be used as a repository to store data so everyone can have access, especially as chairs change.

c. New Template Outline

Jaclyn explained the proposed PR outline is intentionally skeletal. Jaclyn has shared with several colleagues to solicit feedback before moving forward. The outline shows the structure and sections planned for the template. She is looking for feedback from IEC. Lisa inquired if the template is instructional or administrative. Executive Counsel suggested coloring coding items that are mandatory from ACCJC. There will be two templates: instructional and non-instructional. Corey provided historical information about how the document ended up being the size and the form that is it. In 2006-07, Cerro Coso created the original program review document based on ACCJC guidelines. ACCJC guidelines were converted to



Minutes

questions for PR in order to forge a tight relationship between the accrediting agency and our chancellor's office. The PRC restructured the outline to pull anything with PLOs and SLOs together in the same sections to avoid repetitiveness. Prompts to be rephrased in a way to get the needed information without irrelevancies. The prompts were perceived as more of a checklist rather than items to consider, which resulted in extremely long narratives. Please email Jaclyn with any additional feedback on the document/outline. Executive Council will do one more review before sending to Academic Senate as a whole. The next goal is to implement any feedback and begin entering prompts.

5. Integrated Planning

a. Suggested Revisions in Template and Process from Admin/Faculty Chairs

Corey reviewed all feedback collected in length. The real integrated planning template is a live document on the website. The AUP template shared is a word document Corey uses for reference. AUP feedback was reviewed. Ryan will provide static reports by August 15 and dashboards will be available at all times. Ryan would like to see what exactly is needed for AUP to complete the static reports. Corey will round back with Ryan on past examples. If a budget is approved, chairs would like to be notified. Lisa advised the budget software may solve some of the communication issues. The software has a training component and requestors will be able to track requests. Heather suggested mapping/cross walking to other goals and plans already created around equity. Prepare documents that are available as an executive summary. All plans ultimately result in goals. An institutional crosswalk mapping goals to institutional documents would be helpful. Dawn would like to see autofill for all prior year outcomes, not just the outcomes missed. Especially during these times, a more accessible document is needed. Chairs would like to be able to access this document from home without using the remote desktop. Corey will revise the document and prepare for review before faculty go off contract. Ben suggesting adding a note: where applicable, progress towards program review goals. Process is written out in the participatory governance handbook, any updates will show up in the next PGH.

b. Revisions of units/sections

Corey asked the group to think about parts of the college that should be a unit and complete a unit plan or should be a section and complete a section plan. The topic is mostly surrounding ISEP and where it should be represented in our planning process.

Item tabled to the next meeting on March 25, 2021

6. Archiving/Deleting Old Governance Materials

Item tabled to the next meeting on March 25, 2021

7. Review of Action Items

- *Program Review Committee to draft expectations of the deans' role with Program Review to be shared in the March IEC meeting*



Minutes

- *Corey to generate a draft AUP template with proposed changes and share in the March IEC meeting*
8. **Future Agenda Items**
 - Data Governance*
 - Determine if midterm report is still necessary*
 - Revision of Units/Sections*
 9. **Future Meeting Dates: Thursday, March 25, 2021 at 3:00 pm**
 10. **Adjournment**
 - Meeting adjourned at 4:36 pm by Corey Marvin*

Meeting Chair: Corey Marvin

Recorder: Lacey Navarro