

Senate Work Group: Institutional Student Achievement Standards, 2013
March 20, 2013

The following attendees met to discuss the tentative institutional student achievement standards required for inclusion on the ACCJC annual report due at the end of March 2013. Because of the late notice that these standards would need to be set, the group was only able to meet one time. The notes provide a summary of the actions and plans taken by Institutional Research and Planning as a result of the discussion.

Attendees

Christina Gold (Behavioral & Social Sciences/Senate)
Don Goldberg (Math/Dean)
Irene Graff (Institutional Research and Planning/Director)
Vanessa Haynes (Counseling/CEC)
Moon Ichinaga (Learning Resources Unit/Senate)
Lars Kjeseth (Math/Basic Skills)
Tom Lew (Humanities/Dean)
Jeanie Nishime (Student & Community Advancement/VP)
Jenny Simon (ESL/Curriculum Chair)
Merriel Winfree (Industry and Technology/Senate)

IRP Actions and Plans Derived from the Discussion

Changes from and comments on the discussion:

1. Added mention of the positive influence of the changed W date on success rates as a factor contributing to the set standard. (p. 1)
2. Lowered Retention (aka Persistence) Rate standard by 0.5 points as a hedge against the uncertain effects of future changes derived from the Student Success Act and course repeatability.
3. Degrees/Certificates - unchanged. We feel that these standards are set at a safe level.
4. Transfers - lowered to the 5-year average vs. the 3-year average based on an assessment of the wide fluctuations during this period and the many external factors that affect these counts, which are outside of institutional control.

Moving forward:

1. Performance will be tracked over time. IR will create graphical displays of trends with an overlay of the standard (and average, min and max rates/counts noted) for those rates that have institutional meaning.
2. Methodology for all rates (as well as the methodology and process used for setting standards) will be documented and publicized.
3. IR recommends that additional disaggregated rates be based on a starting point statistical methodology to be reviewed for feedback through the consultation process. Individual program adjustments to these standards should be made only if accompanied by valid justifications based on expert knowledge of past or future factors.
4. In general, we should continue to evaluate our performance by including the exploration of external research reports and available performance data, which can be used to inform the setting of goals for student achievement.
5. The college will discuss the setting of goals for which to strive through collegial consultation processes as well as the upcoming Planning Summit.