

**El Camino College Compton Center
Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

Minutes

November 10, 2016

1:00PM Board Room

Attendees: Bonacic, Trish; Flor, Paul; Lopez, Felipe; Marsh Katherine; Radcliffe, Kendahl; Pham, Hoa; Hughes, Gloria; Mills, Jesse; McKinzie, Amankwa; Tatilioglu, Abby. Marina Hernandez, Note Taker.

I. Call to order

Meeting called to order at 1:10 by Paul Flor. Thanked everyone for coming out. Added Committee goals to the agenda.

II. Approval of minutes from last meeting

Trish Bonacic suggested at the last meeting that Joshua Meadors be a member of the committee since he attends all the meetings. They have now received the official list of members and he's not on there so she's not sure if that is appropriate or not. Paul Flor stated that it is his understanding that Josh is a floater. We can use him when we are reading certain programs but he is not a member of the standing committee. He is not opposed to being a member. We should extend an invitation for him to be a part of the committee. It was moved by Gloria Hughes and seconded by McKinzie to accept the minutes.

III. Open issues

a) Updates on Program Review Process/Jesse Report

Jesse Mills addressed the drafted document with highlights. At the last meeting they were in agreement about the timing of things such as when they would provide the faculty with the notification. He and Josh are working on getting the data to them almost immediately. They thought it would be a couple of weeks after the semester has started but they can give them notification that their data and templates are available before a month has passed. The issue they were having the most difficulty with was the language about whether submissions were proficient, not approved, or needs improvement. Maybe this language was in the original notes from the beginning of the semester but as we move forward to develop a rubric to evaluate the program review we may need to change the language. Just wanted to open it up to the committee with this process document. We may need to have this discussion along with the discussion of the rubric. How are we going to judge the Program Review and what is the verdict going to be? Is it going to be proficient, not proficient? Are we going to have a sliding scale? He needs advice from the committee. Paul Flor stated the purpose of Program Review is for programs to explain their triumphs and

deficiencies and how they are addressing the deficiencies. Also, as part of our Budget and Planning process he's not sure if proficient is sufficient. You may want to include satisfactory meaning it meets most of our expectations as opposed to proficient is we are going to accept it the way it is but we are not going to give it any priority in Budget and Planning. Then needs improvement means we send it back to the authors for them to address feedback and recommendations. When they return it and they don't address the feedback and recommendations satisfactory then it is not approved. Jesse asked if he was suggesting with the approved ones that we find a way to tier them in terms of what are the best ones which will receive top priority. That would be the satisfactory and then proficient reviews. There should be a threshold when something is satisfactory. That's the premise they were working under with Felipe. So now it will be Satisfactory, Proficient, Needs Improvement, and Not Approved. So that will change the implications. As it is on the draft sheet, needs improvement or not approved implies that the person has 30 days to address and resubmit this will change the implications. If someone gets proficient, they can decide if they want to try to get satisfactory or stay at proficient. The committee is going to share the feedback with the authors. Then it's up to the author what they chose to do. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is only the evaluator of the reports then it goes to Budget and Planning to determine who will get priority. After the initial review if they get a satisfactory or proficient they are ok. A discussion ensued over the use of the words "satisfactory, proficient, and exemplary." It was agreed that #7 will be "submissions will be deemed exemplary, proficient, or needs improvement." Any submission that needs improvement will be given 30 days to address issues and resubmit. The not approved is on the second step once they have bought it back. They should resubmit to their Dean first will be added to #8. A training was scheduled for yesterday that no one registered for. Chelvi cancelled it but members of Life Science showed up anyway so they met for an hour. Jesse spoke with the Deans to see who was responsible for PR in their areas and he has been meeting with some of the authors of the reports. Someone mentioned that the Chairs are not listed anywhere on the PR document. Does it need to go through them and what responsibility do they have? Barb replied they have a responsibility to make sure that the faculty members are doing their job. They are there more as a resource. Next week Jesse is taking the training at ECC and will be working on getting the Program Reviews on the website as part of our accreditation effort. He has spoken to some PR authors whose reviews are due this semester and some of them have done the PRs but they have not received the input from their Dean. History, Communication Studies, Child Development, and English have been completed. Barb stated that we have a few PR's that have been done that are just sitting there (Math and Communication Studies). She was hoping that we could get some volunteers to review those and get them done by the end of December. We may be more liberal with those since they were submitted so long ago. If it's something glaring that's one thing but if we can see where it can be better, we can write those comments but accept the Review. Members of the committee stated they had already given their comments for those reviews to Dr. Wanda Morris and also to Felipe Lopez. Barb will work with the two of them to get the information. Then we can focus on the reviews due this year. Jesse added he is concerned about the reviews from History and Social Science. The authors didn't know how to make a request for data from Josh. He did it for them and he's

concerned about those two reviews. Dr. Pham stated that Dr. Morris had informed the group that Josh would automatically send them the data. It never came so she did her own. The lead person didn't know to make the request. Barb said it should be automatic. Jesse will sit with Josh and make the request on behalf of faculty. Paul wondered if it would be possible to use some of the IPI funds for a system to track this information. Faculty and members of the committee can then see that it's been submitted or requested. Barb added that with the PR Coordinator we should be ok for now. The Coordinator will make them aware of when the review is due and they can work on it during their down time. It was always automatic that the data would be available. With the transition from ECC to Compton it fell through the cracks. Mack suggested a shared folder for members of the committee and authors submitting information. Barb added that they are looking for a new program for Program Review and Annual Plans so they are linked.

b) Discussion on Proposed Rubrics:

- Academic – discussion/recommendations on ECC Rubric

The committee discussed pages 16-21 for comments and suggestions. Everyone should have the new template that matches the rubric perfectly. The old PR's do not line up. The information from IR is embedded in the template. At the end of the process is when we give our rating. We now have a sub-committee of 5 people reviewing the PR's. Someone on the committee will give them the feedback. Make sure that all CTE programs receive the supplemental questions in their packets. Add the ratings of the sub-committee.

- Administrative – pending

Trish stated they had been in contact with Felipe for their recommendations on what would be their preferred rubric and got no response. Felipe shared with the group earlier that all of his documents would be done by November 1. She also contacted Dr. Curry about who would be taking Felipe's place. This item is still pending.

c) Finalization of Administrative Program Review Schedule – pending

This item is still pending. The composition of the sub-committee is one faculty member, two managers from a related area, and one classified. This review cycle should be keeping up with other areas.

d) Finalization of Members on the Four Subcommittees – pending

Paul stated he has had a hard time recruiting faculty to serve on the sub-committees. By December 8, the committees should be finalized. The only committee with a student is Student Services. There are two committees for Academics. One for CTE and one academic. The composition is the same. Two faculty members, one administrator related to area, one classified, and one from the PR committee is the make-up for the subcommittees. Mack will work to get a classified person.

e) Program Review Handbook

The committee would like a recommendation to modify the rubric. This will be the document we adopt. This will be our starting point and we will make additions or deletions.

IV. New business

a) 2017 Compton College Comprehensive Master Plan

The Committee will be asking for approval of the Comprehensive Master Plan at the December 8, meeting. This is merely an endorsement from the Committee. It would be great if the consultant who worked on this could be present at the next meeting. They will speak to Dr.'s Curry and Osanyinpeju about this.

b) Other

There will be no meetings during the winter session. The latest version of the campus standing committees has us meeting on Tuesday and not Thursday. Also the meetings are listed to be held in the Library and not the Board Room. Dr. Pham should be added to the committee. Dr. Curry's office is constantly revising the list to keep it current.

c) Committee Goals

Goals for the committee are as follows: Program Review Handbook, Program Review website, setting a goal for how many programs we plan to review, finalize the administrative review cycle and rubric, and playing a role in how IEPI monies for new software for Program Review. After this cycle all programs for review will be done in the fall.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm

Lillie Rodgers, Note Taker