

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

AGENDA			
	Topic	Time	Discussion/Outcome
1.	Welcome	1:30	
2.	Review of the Agenda	1:33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed and accepted.
3.	Approval of the October 25th Minutes	1:38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to approve the minutes, K. Coreas, and L. Chaplot seconded the motion, motion was approved with two abstentions.
4.	Purpose and Function, and Goals – Finalized	1:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose and Function: approved. Goals: Do we do goal number three? PIE is probably the committee that works the closest with this, but PIE does come through IEC. What do we do in terms of regular review as far as effectiveness is concerned? If we are Institutional Effectiveness, we should know if things are working the way we need them to be effective. Including the VP PIEs. Is it more about reviewing and making recommendations when looking at how they are effective? If we evaluate, what is the process by which we evaluate? In the past IEC looked at if we were meeting our strategic plan, and how are we spending money. We looked at our plan and determined what we needed to change. It was an evaluative process. Remove goal three. Add PIE to goal two, “including PIE” at the end of the sentence.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the ACCJC new Standards with concern for our college processes. • The new standards are really focused on data. • Will IEC be able to work on the new standards this year? • For implications of IEC work, we should always look at the standards and make sure that we are meeting them. • New Goal added: Review the ACCJC accreditation standards for alignment with collegewide institutional effectiveness strategies. • Edit to Goal 6: Make actionable recommendations to stakeholder groups for campus-wide communication plans that support the College’s strategic priorities two and six as well as The Chancellor’s Office, Vision 2030, Action 11.
5.	Communication <u>Recommendation</u> to PAC	1:55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication recommendation to PAC to think about a strategic communication plan. • Is this active or passive? We are approaching this in a very broad way. • Purposed Revised Language: Consider the development of a strategic communication plan to ensure timely and accurate dissemination of information when situations occur on campus. The communication plan should include: a decision tree offering various contingencies, a list of inter and intra-divisional expectations, and a means through which open and authentic feedback can be communicated. • Add a preamble, to explain to PAC the background and reason for the request.
6.	PIE Cycle Recommendation – From PIEC	2:05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PIE cycle will include comprehensive PIE, Mini PIE, and VP PIE. A Rubric is needed including DEISA+. • The first thing we tackled is the PIE cycle. • The workgroup researched several other colleges to see what their cycle is. • Most colleges have three to six-year cycles. • The recommendation is a comprehensive PIE every five years. Then in the off years, they do an annual review, and resources are included. • The feedback has been that the cycle is happening too fast. The workgroup has landed on a five-year cycle. • Five-year program review cycle has been approved by the PIE committee. With “mini-PIEs” or reviews in between.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When IEC votes, if approved this then goes to PAC for approval. • PIE decided that we can implement this change in pieces. • We can start implementing it partially next year. • Are there other programs that have more frequent requirements? • The CTE reviews the curriculum every two years, based on advisory recommendations. • PIE landed at five years to align with the curriculum review cycle. • Investigate the timing of the assessment cycle to coordinate with Program Review and Courses Outline of Records (COR) revisions so that work in one area leads to work in the next; and make recommendations. • C&I has been cogitating AP 4020, outcomes assessment cycles are included. • Faculty use outcomes to drive their program review. • Curriculum is due every five years, there is a list each year. This is not the same as the five-year program review cycle. • Faculty may have a different need than other areas. • Discussion of a staggered cycle. • We would still have a process every year. Just not the large all-in compassing Program Review every year. • Some colleges offer coaching to assist with program review and they also give feedback to every request. • We also must think about the template. Different areas may need different questions asked. We need to make it meaningful. • Since we have this opportunity to revise how to make this work for us, we will have another accreditation cycle and we need to make sure that the templates are reviewed for alignment with ACCJC standards. • Perhaps we can have a department volunteer who can do a pilot of the mini-PIE. • Five-year cycle: Approved.
7.	Planning for EPAC	2:20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPAC, Tuesday, November 28th 3 pm-5 pm. • A crosswalk with our strategic planning goals and Vision 2030. • Working through how we are currently aligned.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P. Quinones will work on the agenda and send it out to the committee.
8.	Accreditation Core Inquiries	2:35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick Review: • The Core Inquiries will be sent out to the college this week. • The college now only focuses on these Core Inquiries. • Review of inquiries and how they effect IEC • Governance Structure: How do we evaluate our structure and how do they work together? Who is evaluating how effective the governance committees work? • There will be several IEC members present during the visit. • RSI: they will take another random sample to make sure that it is happening on campus. • Fifth Inquiry: they want to know how effective these programs are through data. • Analysis and evaluation are something that falls under IEC.
9.	PIE Update (Krupa)	2:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postponed until next meeting.
10.	Budget Committee Update (Rosa)	2:55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postponed until next meeting.
Fall 2023 Meetings: November 22nd, December 13th.			