Mt. San Antonio College	Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda			<b>March 13, 2023</b> 1:30 p.m 3:00 p.m.   Zoom	
Director, Research & Institutional Effectiveness (Co-Chair)	Patty Quinones	х	Budget Committee Liaison	Rosa Royce	х
Assistant Dean, Accreditation and Planning (Co-Chair)	Lianne Greenlee	х	Instructional Services (appointed by VP Instruction)	Sylvia Ruano	
Faculty Outcomes Coordinator (Co-Chair)	Kelly Coreas	х	Academic Senate President or Designee	Tania Anders	х
Faculty Noncredit (appointed by AS)	Landry Chaplot	х	Director of Human Resources or Designee	Ryan Wilson	х
Associate Vice President, Instruction	Meghan Chen		Faculty – Student Services (appointed by AS)	Vacant	
Classified (appointed by CSEA 262)	Yvette Garcia	х	Student Services (appointed by VPSS)	Lina Soto	х

Guest

Recorder

Classified (appointed by CSEA 651)

Guest – Senior Research Analyst

Vacant

Cathy Stute

Lisa Jackson

Megan Moscol

x

х

Tiffany Kuo

Sean Moon

Krupa Patel

Kate Morales

Barbara Mezaki

Faculty Credit (appointed by AS)

PIE Liaison

Faculty Accreditation Coordinator

Student (appointed by Associated Students)
Information Technology (appointed by VP Admin Services)

	AGENDA				
	Topic	Time	Discussion/Outcome		
1.	Welcome	1:30pm	<ul> <li>Lianne Greelee has been appointed as IEC tri-chair.</li> <li>Lina Soto has been appointed by VPSS as the Student Services designee.</li> <li>Megan Moscol, Senior Facilities Planner, as a guest.</li> </ul>		
2.	Review of the Agenda	1:33pm	<ul> <li>Agenda approved as submitted.</li> <li>Committee tri-chairs to follow-up on student representative Sean Moon.</li> </ul>		
3.	Approval of the November 22 <sup>nd</sup> Minutes	1:38pm	<ul> <li>November 22 minutes approved as submitted; Tiffany, Lina, Barbara, Yvette, and Lianne abstained from the vote.</li> </ul>		
4.	Annual Report: New Programs	1:45pm	<ul> <li>Discussed the Pride Center and why they are under HSS.</li> <li>Ryan's recommendation from this committee would be to put Pride Center under Student Services.</li> <li>Discussed the addition of a unit PIE for the Pride Center. The committee to circle back and have additional discussions about how to move forward.</li> <li>We are required to submit a yearly report to ACCJC on student outcomes and report the data for the previous three (3) years.</li> <li>Discussed the role of IEC in the past which was to establish the institution-set standards.</li> <li>Patty shared the report with the group and provided an overview of the categories. The report is due the second Friday in April.</li> <li>She will bring the report back to the committee once it's fully completed.</li> <li>It was noted that we have new programs that we've never reported on before. How do we handle those programs that we have to report on this year?</li> <li>Patty shared her thoughts on an idea of using an average across all programs.</li> <li>Lianne suggested that we reach out to programs with program directors, deans or associate deans and ask for input on that to bring back to IEC.</li> </ul>		

			<ul> <li>Tiffany stated that all CTE programs have advisory boards and have information already.</li> <li>Lianne inquired about the ISS data and if it's desegregated when pulled. Is it possible to pull it like that for all the metrics we report? Most dashboards have it that way and are embedded in what used to be SEAP dashboards.         <ul> <li>It will be hard for licensure and exam pass rate but for others we can do it</li> </ul> </li> <li>We are heading into a master planning cycle. We need to determine as a committee if the institution-set standards are intended to drive our focus and work.</li> <li>Our focus is student persistence and completion. ACCJC doesn't just want numbers. We have to ask ourselves how we are doing overall, not just the students meeting the metrics.</li> <li>This can be a starting point for us. Our role is to get that out there and help us to drive how we focus the energy of the college.</li> </ul>
5.	ACCJC Update: Peer Team Communication Summary	1:55pm	<ul> <li>Patty shared that as we went through the accreditation process, the core team tried to determine how ISS (Institution-Set Standards) is used for planning.</li> <li>We need to take this back to the programs and departments and see what they have for ISS and stretch goals.</li> <li>Lianne stated that she, Kelly, and Patti met to plan and think about the direction of the committee and the role of IEC in relation to a lot of work happening campus wide.</li> </ul>
6.	ACCJC 2024 Accreditation Standards	2:05pm	October 2023 the ISER report was read. There were 23 questions derived as a result of the technical review.    Standard

9.	PIE Update (Krupa)  Budget Committee Update (Rosa)	2:50pm 2:55pm	<ul> <li>Considering adjusting PIE based on the area. They each reflect on different data elements.</li> <li>Timeline for NRAs that have already happened.</li> <li>The first meeting of the spring is to be held this afternoon. An update will be given at the next IEC meeting.</li> </ul>
8.	PAC Governance Taskforce Recommendation	2:40pm	<ul> <li>PAC approved the change to a three-year cycle.</li> <li>Discussed possibly staggering the cycle.</li> <li>Each department needs to do a PIE – wondering about a checklist or pacing mechanism</li> </ul>
7.	Quality Focus Essay	2:15pm	<ul> <li>looks like moving forward.</li> <li>It's great to have outside eyes review and see how we can do better. This may be a good time for us to revamp program review.         <ul> <li>Reflection and collaboration are needed in order to make PIE more meaningful.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Lianne briefly reviewed and discussed the QFE (Quality Focused Essay). This is the part of self-reflection for accreditation and we can use this to determine what we want to work on and improve.</li> <li>Project One (1) is outcomes assessment and moving outcomes to be meaningful – reviewed the plan from that</li> <li>Project Two (2) strengthen the program review process and noted some measurable outcomes. And strengthen the integration of the program review process and strength and planning process.</li> <li>New ACCJC standards have been released and they define what is intended for institutional work. In addition to a proposed reset, the ACCJC also shared actionable items the committee will act on this spring.</li> <li>Outcomes Assessment Worksheet</li> </ul>
			<ul> <li>If we were going to ask a random faculty member to tell us what PIE is – they will tell is where we put in money requests. PR isn't for someone else to read it's for that team/group and then for college to determine how to use money we have.         <ul> <li>Would we agree that we aren't doing this? It has to be systemic across the college via data use and program review.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Even though we have a template, people still freestyled when completing the PIE which defeats the purpose of having a template.</li> <li>Moving forward, we have to recognize that these are opportunities for us to assess program review and how we are doing and what the PIE process</li> </ul>