Director, Research & Institutional Effectiveness (Co-Chair)	Patty Quinones	X	PIE Liaison	Krupa Patel	X
Assistant Dean, Accreditation and Planning (Co-Chair)	Lianne Greenlee	X	Budget Committee Liaison	Rosa Royce	X
Faculty Outcomes Coordinator (Co-Chair)	Kelly Coreas	X	Dean, Instruction	Sylvia Ruano	X
Academic Senate President or Designee	Tania Anders	X	Instructional Services (appointed by the VP, Instruction)	Andi Sims	X
Faculty Noncredit (appointed by AS)	Landry Chaplot	X	Student Services (appointed by VPSS)	Lina Soto	
Associate Vice President, Instruction	Meghan Chen	X	Director of Human Resources or Designee	Ryan Wilson	X
Classified (appointed by CSEA 262)	Yvette Garcia	X	Faculty – Student Services (appointed by AS)	**Vacant**	
Faculty Credit (appointed by AS)	Tiffany Kuo		Classified (appointed by CSEA 651)	**Vacant**	
Faculty Accreditation Coordinator	Barbara Mezaki	X	Guest – Senior Research Analyst	Cathy Stute	X
Student (appointed by Associated Students)	Sean Moon		Guest – Senior Facilities Planner	Megan Moscol	
Information Technology (appointed by VP Admin Services)	Kate Morales	X	Recorder	Wendi Alcazar	X

AGENDA		
Topic	**Time**	**Discussion/Outcome**
1. **Welcome to New Members**	1:30	
2. **Review of the Agenda**	1:33	• Reviewed.
3. **Approval of the April 24th Minutes**	1:38	• Reviewed. Edit Page 3, last bullet "to PAC to merge them". Motion to approve the minutes with the above changes made by L. Greenlee and the second made by T. Anders.
4. **IEC Goals and Accomplishments**	1:43	• Edits made on the Goals document. • Goal 5: • We need to remove "Action 11" from the Goal; the chancellor has changed this, and what was listed on Aciton 11 has changed.
5. **IEC Recommendations for Comprehensive Program Review Draft**	2:05	• The IEC chairs worked on a draft document for a recommendation for a Comprehensive Program Review. • Edits made on the Comprehensive Program Review draft document.

		- Original draft document: **IEC Recommendations for 3-Year Comprehensive Program Review**
		
		1. Rebrand/ Redesign Program Review
		    • At Mt. SAC the term "PIE" has become synonymous with resource requests and little else
		    • The change to a 3-year cycle allows more time for the thoughtful review of program successes, challenges, data, and future directions to bring meaning to the program review process
		    • Purpose: To make the process more intuitive and meaningful (QFE 1)
		
		2. Re-Educate Campus Community on Program Review
		    • Educate/Train: What is program review and why do we do it?
		    • Purpose: Review our program and make improvements as program experts. The comprehensive review tool will help teams focus on data reflection leading to the development of goals and plans, with aligned resource needs identified
		    • Support:
		        ○ Liaison model of support: Assigned PIE/IEC leads, data coaches, etc.
		        ○ Scaffold the process with timeline of month-by-month steps, worksheets, and resources
		        ○ Resources: Short videos, samples of model Program Review
		
		3. Program Review Structure and Prioritization Transparency
		    • Comprehensive Program Review (every 3 years): All units, managers, and VPs (rubric is available for all resource requests)
		
		    #1 Rebrand/Redesign Program Review: "Program" should say unit. - Will the three-year cycle be staggered? Yes, the plan is to have it staggered. #2 Re-Educate Campus Community: We are missing the planning portion of the Program Review. We need to include the importance of planning for Program Review. - How do we also ensure the importance of using Program Review for planning? - An ongoing planning cycle? #3 Program Review Structure: Comprehensive 3-year Program Review. - All units - every area is a unit. This means everyone does the Comprehensive Program Review. - We need a rubric for all resource requests, aligned with the Educational Facilities Comprehensive Plan. - For example, If you are in KAD, the prioritization decision should be communicated to the area. - We are building the resource prioritization into PIE, and this information will be shared with the unit members. - For Area Validation, we mentioned resources right away. If we are trying to get away from PIE being used for resources, we shouldn't focus on them in this area. - Should the VP Validation be included in the Area Validation? No, some of the work the VPs need to do is beyond Feedback. #4 Adopt the Assess – Reflect – Collaborate – Act nomenclature and cycle. - We should have a map to visualize how the steps fit together. Use the Fiscal Services Budget Development manual map as a template to understand where to start.

			#5 Assess:
			
			4. Adopt the Assess – Reflect – Collaborate – Act nomenclature and cycle in alignment with Outcomes Committee work.
			
			5. ASSESS: Focus on meaningful reflection of disaggregated data (1.3)
			    • Assessment of outcomes (Standard 2)
			    • Assessment of Institution-Set Standards (2.7)
			    • Purpose: Assessment of data drives goals and action plans aligned to the mission through the Educational and Facilities Comprehensive Plan (EFCP) (1.2)
			
			6. REFLECT:
			    • Celebrate Success (What works) Accomplishments/innovations/improvements to close equity gaps & accomplish goals/plans (1.2, 1.3, 1.4)
			    • How past actions impacted student and unit success (What went well? What can be improved?)
			    • Incorporate Infrastructure Resource Documentation and Evaluation
			        o Current staffing (faculty, staff, administrators, and other personnel) over a 3-year period (3.1)
			        o Professional development effectiveness (3.2)
			        o Facilities and equipment, safety, security, maintenance effectiveness (3.8) - Outcomes has some worksheets that we may build into the process. #6 Reflection: We are all siloed, we have no college-wide re-use recycle process for resources, processes, or teaching strategies. - We hope that these changes will foster more collaboration. - We want to share our PIEs, successes, and challenges. - Something about repurposing under resources works well with sustainability. This should be built into the Area Validation. - How effective is professional development? - There is some information that we can share about resources already available on campus. - What is effectiveness? We need to define or create a rubric for this. - Perhaps we can leverage the ACCJC ISER handbook and language. Also, the peer evaluator's guide might be useful. - Is there a gap in the Professional Development training? #7 Collaborate: The plan is to have the goals linked to the Educaitonal Facilities Comprehensive Plan Areas. - The unit would elaborate on how their goals fit with the larger college goals. - Add an Other to the Educational Facilities Comprehensive Plan Goals table. - A shared document will be sent out that everyone can comment on, and then when we discuss it, we will go over the comments and have that lead the discussion.

6.	**Invitation for PIE and Outcomes Committee Members to Attend the 5/22 Meeting**	2:45	We would like to open up our next meeting to PIE so that they can provide feedback on these recommendations.

			- How do IEC members feel about this? Additionally, if they cannot attend, we could bring their feedback to this committee. - Committee agrees to PIE and Outcomes committee members joining the next meeting on May 22, 2024.
7.	**PIE Update** (Krupa)	2:50	- PIE trainings have good attendance. - PIE training is offered via POD, department meetings, dean's meetings, and one-on-one training as needed. - We have updated Nuventive based on user feedback and PIE committee approval.
8.	**Budget Committee Update** (Rosa)	2:55	- The last meeting was on March 27th. The main topic was that Morris reported on the P1 report to the State. - Mt. SAC has a deficit of 9.3 million with the State. - We won't know more until June. The May revision is about to be released, but this hasn't been reported yet.

Spring 2024 Meetings: May 22nd.