1. Call Meeting to Order

2. Review 3/26/14 IEC Notes

3. Action Items

4. Discussion Items

   4.1 Institution-Set Standards (see attached)
      4.1.1 Standards, methods and process at other colleges
      4.1.2 Seven-year trend data to guide standard setting

   4.2 Institutional Effectiveness Summit Preparation, Saturday, April 26
      Final planning (agenda to follow)

5. Other/Future Agenda Items:

Adjourn

PARTICIPANT DETAILS
> Dial your telephone conference line: 913-312-3202 or (888) 886-3951
> Enter your passcode: 979125
1. **Call Meeting to Order: Present:** Keith Snow-Flamer, Kathy Smith, Paul Chown, Julia Peterson, Angelina Hill, Cheryl Tucker, Dan Calderwood, Jeff Cummings, Sally Urban, Tami Matsumoto, Crislyn Parker-support

2. **Review 2/26/14 IEC Notes:** Approved as stand.

3. **Action Items**

4. **Discussion Items**

   4.1 **Review Revised Committee Self-Evaluation draft (attached):**
   - Process: This evaluation is sent to all committee members, the responses collected and returned to the committees, to complete a self-assessment.
   - The following question will be added: “did the committee accomplish its annual goals?”
   - The results will be reviewed at the IE Summit.

   4.2 **Determine date of administration:** Evaluation will be sent the week of March 31, 2014

   4.3 **Resource Requests Prioritization and Integrated Planning Process –draft revision (attached):**
   - The timeline will be revised to include the revised resource request process in program review
   - Two steps:
     - o 1) authors/deans identify needs in their program review
     - o 2) resource requests go through the deans and directors for prioritization prior to going through the BPC prioritization committee process
   - Clarifying language will be added:
     - o The type of funding; the allocation process; whether smaller requests at the operational level denied through the dean prioritization still go to the BPC functional committee process
     - o How requests funded at the dean’s level (i.e. technology) get vetted for viability
   - Some of these questions will be discussed at the summit. One suggestion: for viability, vet needs through IT or facilities when preparing the program review, **prior to** submitting the request.

   4.4 **Institutional Effectiveness Summit Preparation, Saturday, April 26:**
   - Location: AT 103/104 confirmed; lunch menu discussion in process
   - Agreed to include a fishbowl activity, definitely including BPC and PRC
   - Draft a chart for visual learners; discuss the timeline
   - Identify gaps in the planning processes
   - Discuss institutional standards at the summit

   4.4 **Institution-set Standards**
   4.4.1 Course completion rate
   4.4.2 Student retention percentage (fall to fall persistence)
   4.4.3 Degree completion number
   4.4.4 Transfer to 4-year colleges/universities number
   4.4.5 Certificate completion number

   **From Draft Revised Standards:**
   **I.A.3 – The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.**
   **I.B.3 – The institution publishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement.**
I.B.5 – The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals and objectives through analysis of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery.

- The annual report to ACCJC requires inclusion of institutional standards. As an institution we need to set standards for each indicator (see 4.1.1- 4.1.5). Standards are not goals, but performance expectations. Jack pond likened to accreditation standards: you can meet, then go beyond; but if don’t meet you have identified an area of focus (one difference, there is no penalty from ACCJC if an institution falls short of their institutional standards). Basically, it is establishing a minimum baseline of which the institution expects to maintain; and, hopefully improve upon.
- Next steps: determine the baseline (meeting minimum expectations of what we determine an effective institution should be) by: 1. Looking at past indicators; 2. Look at peer groups 3. Data taken from new student cohorts.
- Add a target goal column for the scorecard; clarify that if we meet our standards, we still wasn’t to continue and try to exceed them. Suggested the right side of the scorecard has CR benchmark, external benchmarks and target benchmark; the left side has the actual for a 3 year period. ACCJC want to know we are evaluating ourselves on annual basis using these internal standards.
- IEC will draft minimum/benchmark standards and send to the EMC next for discussion. Angelina will compile additional information and email to the committee.

5. Other:
- Follow-up on IEC recommendations to PRC: the DE program review recommendation was taken to the PRC. Angelina will take an example to the March 28 meeting. The PRC is not sure what format it will take, but agreed that a program review would be beneficial to identify gaps and resource requests, at least during the first few years.

Future Agenda Items:
Benchmark institutional standards; Add to timeline evaluating targets after standards are determined.

Adjourn