

Institutional Effectiveness  
Council Minutes  
January 26, 2016 – 1 - 3PM  
E-112

MEMBERS

Name	Representing	Present	Absent
Brian Lofman	Adj 0.349 0 Td (iyd (dj 0.349 0 Td (iyd (dj MCI0<</MCID 11 >>Byd (dj MCI11 >>Byd (		

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 1:05 PM

Brian Lofman

**ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Consideration of Approval of Minutes from November 24, 2015 Meeting **Motioned** (Dominguez) **Seconded** (Pyer) and carried, the IEC moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Brian Lofman
  
- 2. Consideration of Approval of Institution-Set Standards for 2015-16 **Motioned** (Dominguez) **Seconded** (Burns) and carried, the IEC moved to approve the Institution-Set Standards for 2015-16 as submitted. Brian Lofman
  
- 3. Consideration of Approval of Year-Two Goals Framework of Indicators for Establishing Goals for Institutional Effectiveness **Motioned** (Burns) **Seconded** (Pinet) and carried, the IEC moved to approve the Year-Two Goals Framework of Indicators as submitted. Brian Lofman

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS**

1. Standards for Job Placement

Dr. Lofman explained this survey was implemented as a result of being

Brian Lofman/Layheng Ting



Natalia presented the Goals explaining the breakdown between "Student Performance Outcomes (SPO)", "Fiscal Health" and "Programmatic compliance". She explained the indicators and pointed out that the three SPO were in alignment with the ACCJC standards. That is, the Course completions were based upon the fall semester. She then proceeded to read the definitions and opened the floor for questions. The Council reflected on the numbers and Dr. Ting questioned the methodology used. (decreased by 5%). Natalia explained that was trying to align the two (Institutional Set Standards) and (Goals for Institutional Effectiveness) methodologies. Dr. Lofman concluded that there needed to be consistency with prior years so only the "mean" would be considered to set the goals. Natalia further explained the Fiscal Health indicators. Tracy Richardson pointed out that there should be a realistic approach to set these goals since it would be challenging to comply. The committee concurred that was better to underestimate than not being able to achieve the goals.

Finally Natalia pointed out that the Programmatic Compliance indicators needed some definition. Tracy pointed out that there was an error on the materials posted in the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Website, showing 2013-2014 for Audit Findings "unmodified". Dr. Lofman agreed and explained that this information was taken from the chancellor's portal. Dr. Ting was aware as well. Natalia explained that in the document being presented there was correction since she and Tracey had met to go over the data. Tracey asked if this portal could be changed and offered help to talk to someone at the chancellor's office to correct this. Natalia will look into who can we contact to make this corrections. The office would bring this page again eliminating the added column of percentage decrease and focusing only in the average.

Dr. Lofman proceeded to introduce the topic of the considerations for the establishment of 6 year goals. He referred the council to the second page of the document and pointed out that this was a "challenging" task since there were a) a large number of uncontrollable factors, b) possible change in funds that were eliminated, c) that the model wouldn't necessarily be a straight line, but rather more curvilinear. The majority of the committee concurred with the concerns of "predicting the future" and there were questions about the type of guidance provided by the chancellor's office. Dr. Lofman explained that there was not much guidance but that we were checking with partner

CCCCO. The purpose of the team to make available peer teams to help the institution through issues, and provide a menu of options to help come up with a plan to alleviate issues in the future. The PRT will make its 2<sup>nd</sup> visit back to Hartnell in early March. Brian Lofman and David Beymer are both on external teams.

BL went on to explain the graph and Data Warehouse and the goal to help us with analysis, policies and developing more accurate data. He shared the Letter of Interest that was presented to the Chancellor to request PRT consideration, and also the background information as to why we are requesting the assistance of the PRT.

A request was made to provide council with a copy of the report from the initial visit to Hartnell by the PRT.

#### 5. Analytic Maturity Index

Brian Lofman

Dr. Lofman shared Analytic Maturity Index graph and touched on 2 items that scored lowest that would be 2 areas of concentration: Data/Reporting/Tools and Investment. Highest scoring was Culture and Process. Dr. Lofman

1.2187w7 TD c-6(h)1(a)-12(h)1(e)-7(d) theth wath9m..4 13.44 2Q81tc(li7(d)-4( )wtB5(c)3((li79m..4 (n)1(d)-4(Ccli79m..4

