Redwoods Community College District
Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting

Wednesday, March 12, 2008
12:00 p.m.
Board Room

**Members Present:** Martha Davis, Roxanne Metz, Steve Grimes, Dave Arnold, Melissa Green, Lisa, Susan Wendt.

**Others Present:** Michele Vagle, Noel Roberts

Martha Davis started the meeting by introducing Melissa Green, the newest IEC committee member. Melissa is replacing Tracey Thomas who resigned due to other committee responsibilities. She explained to all present that we were reviewing Action Plans.

1. **Action Plan:** Roxanne Metz went over the Action Plan spreadsheet and reported she is missing Susan Larkin’s as she hasn’t received it yet. We could have up to six plans to review on Friday. Roxanne went through each plan and explained where each one is at in the process. Roxanne has submitted Michael Regan’s plan and Jason Leppaluoto’s comments to Steve Stratton for Fridays CPC meeting. Martha recommends putting a hold on this as Jason’s comments were not included in the Action Plan, but added later after the IEC had a chance to review and comment. So without reviewing these it really isn’t ready to go forward. If the IEC members have a chance to review and comment before Friday then we will go ahead, if not it will go on hold. Roxanne reported that instructions need to be clarified for the next go around. The committee is evaluating its own processes as different documents are being reviewed. The committee agrees that as we revise the process, plans need to be fully reviewed again to be thorough and consistent. Susan Wendt asked what the process will be for clarifying which draft is being looked at and reviewed. Roxanne is working this out as she does not have administrative support at this time.

Roxanne went over #8 (Lisa Liken’s) plan first. Lisa received comments back to improve her action plan. Her Action Plan is to expose EOPS students to employment opportunities through a field trip. Roxanne went through it with Lisa before the plan was submitted and those comments have already been incorporated. Martha suggested she could use this group as a cohort to attain or create some measurable objectives. Martha told her to look at what she is trying to gain by doing this in order to obtain measurable objectives. Roxanne reported she received feedback from a group she took to HSU that it is useful to do this as they told her that being on the campus they could actually see themselves there, it seemed doable to them now. Steve Grimes pointed out that learning community cohorts we do now are creating baseline data to use for future...
measurement. Lisa received feedback to think of this as doing bigger as resources allow.

Next Roxanne went over plans 2-4, they will be done the 28th due to presenter unavailability.

The STARS Action Plan has two sets of reviews and comments, they have resubmitted so Roxanne and Dave Arnold will need to re-review. This will be presented this Friday.

ESOL is not yet ready and anticipates it for the 28th.

Eureka Wi-Fi requires library comments first, because it will require library staff to check ID cards, signature of documents then giving a password. So we need to see how much human resource time will be required.

Student Athlete Orientation, received comments and made the requested changes, the resubmitted the plan. Roxanne has some concerns as to who is really impacted. Roxanne would also like verification that all managers were spoken to. Original documents are being held by Crislyn Parker. Some sent e-signatures or phone calls though. Pat Girczyc suggested that there be some type of blanket statement that signatures verify that managers have been spoken to so the committee can accept that. Roxanne clarified we need to be sure everyone is clear what their signature means.

So, we are sending Field Trip, Wi-Fi if we get comments, STARS, then CAD Lab possibly.

Melissa had a question about creating a timeline for moving these forward based on comments, when received, etc. to be fair to all.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 9, 2008
12:00 pm – 1:00 pm
Location: TBA

Submitted by: Michele Vagle, IR Account Clerk
IEC is charged with summarizing the program reviews. They went back to the chairs, have come back to the committee, then determined that each functional group would interview the division chair. The heads of the functional groups interview the div. chairs. (with sub-committee) Using the Business Div. as a model to do this. She then did a summary then in turn came back to the facilities plan functional person and made corrections. What the IEC is charged with I having the facilities planning committee make recommendation for this on the data base Martha has created. Steve Stratton has graciously agreed to enter the data.

This is the 1st of the 7 interviews for the facilities. These were made by the group the last time. Now we move to #2, Dept. Info Svcs. Request for CES (Chris Gaines). Estimate is $400/sq.ft. the requestors feel this is important for continued success of the program. Discussion on the ADA Compliance button and purpose, it refers to current ADA issues, not in the new building. Discussion over this being a brand new building, furniture, etc. This was coded as a long-term plan. Martha pointed out this is a general overview, not detailed as these will be covered by other groups/committees.

#3 Info Science for Del Norte – Housed in temp building lease from Del Norte Unified School Dist. Steve McCollum pointed out the current lease agreement ends 12/08, would this change priority? Martha said yes, but we aren’t changing anything from the interview, just adding comments. Was mentioned by Tim the current facility is ADA compliant. The is a long term Plan. This is to ensure these things are addressed so people know they were heard.

#4 Industrial Tech. – Woodshop - Need a new paint booth, better ventilation, etc. They (Division Chair) believed this was a health & safety issue. Bill Connors pointed out this space was closed for a semester to address safety issues, but addt. Remodeling brought back health & safety issue. Dan Walker wants to make clear the intake from these fumes is going into the welding dept. Needs to meet OSHA standards. The committee agreed to check the box ADA Compliance issue. Checked Long-term Plan for now.

#5 Hospitality/Restaurants – New Cafeteria. Both Health & Safety & ADA Compliance checked by Chair. This is a long term plan. Also involves moving culinary arts from Arcata to here.

#6 – Hospitality/Tourism – Gas Lines need replacement due to capacity. Need to determine who’s responsibility. This expense would not be necessary if the program is moved to Eureka, the comment was made. Facilities Planning Assessment – Long Term Plan. Will need to determine if this is really a health & safety issues and who id responsible. Committee decided not to decide at all until we decide who is responsible.

#7 – Computer Info Systems – Networking Equipment Cabinets for proper ventilation in the new building. Comment added that all of this issue will be decided as building is
designed. Roxanne pointed out that the issues were raised in Program Review to ensure their concerns are heard in relation to the new building. Jose recommended the priority be lowered since it will be addressed in new building design. Pat suggested making new building issues a separate category. Coded Long Term Planning.

IEC – 1:30

Steve Stratton, Pat G., Roxanne, Steve G., Martha, Dave Arnold, Danny Walker, Michael Bailey.

Roxanne passed out the rating sheets “Action Plan” What was decided the planning will rate, then out in aggregate rating sheet. Roxanne has 2 broad ? for discussion today.
Should IEC Rate These and 2 What should the IEC be doing with these as they come in. Discussion followed on how the IEC would organize themselves to review these action plans as they will be coming in often at the 11th hour.

The evaluation form concerns Martha. Roxanne said we will review and provide feedback to the submitter and also to the planning council. A Mentor piece to the submitter and a different role to the action planning committee.

Michael Regan’s is complete to review on the web site, Helen Edwards.

Danny asked for clarification, We get the action plan, review make comment, send back then it’s returned to us then if its good it goes on to the action planning committee, or with more suggestion back to submitter. Martha though suggested that maybe we shouldn’t review a second time.

Dave Arnold volunteered to review all five that we have now. We will give back to the submitter an itemized list by number of suggestions. Things they need to do to clean up and get ready for “prime time”. Also give them a new due date with corrections. Also if they put someone else is impacted, it needs to be sent to them also for feedback in a timely manner as well to be included. Give to them Monday ask for it back by end of day Tuesday and then a process for sending out to impacted areas. Also need to discuss how to do the comments we want to give the planning council. So the total # received will be divided up so each is looked at by two sets of eyes. By end of day Friday Roxanne or Crisyln will send out which ones to review with typed instructions on how to do.