

**PASADENA CITY COLLEGE  
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 2012  
Room C233**

**The following Institutional Effectiveness Committee members and guests were present:**

<p><b><u>CO-CHAIRS</u></b> Shelagh Rose, Languages Division Cynthia Olivo, Associate Dean, SLS Counseling</p> <p><b><u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u></b> Salomon Davila, Engineering &amp; Technology Krista Goguen, Library Sonya Valentine, Natural Sciences Susan Briggs, CEC Cecile Davis Anderson, Counseling Lynora Rogacs, Social Sciences</p> <p><b><u>MANAGEMENT MEMBERS</u></b> Jim Arnwine, Division Dn. Performing &amp; Com Arts Joe Futtner, Division Dn. Visual Arts and Media Studies Crystal Kollross, Interim Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Enrollment Management</p>	<p><b><u>CLASSIFIED STAFF MEMBERS</u></b> Carlos Altamirano, TLC Leticia Velez, DSP&amp;S</p> <p><b><u>STUDENT MEMBERS</u></b> Matilde Retrespo</p> <p><b><u>RESOURCE EXPERTS</u></b> David Colley, Interim, Enrollment Manager, Planning Analyst</p> <p><b><u>GUESTS</u></b> Matthew Jordan, Coordinator Assessment/C&amp;I Sheri Stoddard for Terry</p>
---	---

**The following Institutional Effectiveness Committee members were absent:**

<p><b><u>FACULTY MEMBERS</u></b> Terry Stoddard, Kinesiology Melanie Willhide, Visual Arts &amp; Media Studies Jeong K. O, Health Sciences Division Otilio Perales, English Division Stephanie Fleming, Performing &amp; Com. Arts Jamal Ashraf, Business &amp; Computer Technology</p> <p><b><u>CLASSIFIED STAFF MEMBERS</u></b> Wendy Lucko, Engineering &amp; Technology</p>	
---	--

**CALL TO ORDER**

C. Olivo convened the meeting at 12:40 p.m. in Room C233.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

The committee members introduced themselves.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**C. Olivo** informed the committee that she's working on the document for our broad recommendations that is going to be sent around campus. She will have a version for the committee to review at the next meeting. She also told the committee that the co-chairs met with B. Miller and explained why we are not the body to come to for Program Discontinuance.

### **RECONCILIATION SUMMARY PRESENTATION – TEAM 1: BIOTECHNOLOGY**

The BioTechnology Reconciliation Summary was presented. The BioTechnology Program Review and Reconciliation Summary was voted on and approved unanimously.

### **RUBRIC**

**Rubric for Evaluation of Annual Assessment - M. Jordan** distributed the document entitled, "Rubric for Evaluation of Annual Assessment Report." He explained that he extracted some of the course level assessment points from the existing rubric and produced this rubric. He is in the process of meeting with faculty from different divisions and the question of how is program outcome assessment going to happen in the program review work space was raised. He and D. Colley decided that the easiest way to accomplish this task is to fit assessment into the existing structure of the components, outcomes and measures. It would be in TaskStream as a narrative box where you are given a very simple structure to follow. The committee asked the following questions:

- a. **How would the narrative be scored?**  
M. Jordan responded that it would be up to the Committee to decide how to score the assessment or maybe a subcommittee. The subcommittee would bring in more people to review the assessments so it wouldn't be up to this group to decide whether they would be scored based on a rubric or something else.
- b. **Would programs be doing assessment every year?**  
M. Jordan responded that most programs have 2 to 3 outcomes; his view is that they should not be doing assessment every year but definitely should have done all of them within a six-year period.
- c. **Is it a goal to have reviews of disciplines?**  
M. Jordan responded that because he does C&I he envisions that there is going to be transfer model curriculums in most of the departments in your divisions; faculty would probably elect to do them so that would bring them under program review.
- d. **How does a Program Review differ from an Annual Assessment Report?**  
M. Jordan responded that Program Reviews are based on program achievement areas (i.e., AA Degrees, Certificates) and the Annual Assessment Report will be done by Discipline.
- e. **How long does the committee want the new transfer model curriculums to be up and running before they do a program review?**  
M. Jordan responded that the committee agreed that the new transfer model curriculums should have 2-years, at a minimum, before they are required to do a program review.
- f. **When assessing are you only expecting to see 1 or 2 SLOs per course?**  
M. Jordan responded that in your annual assessment report; you would probably assess 1 SLO per semester?
- g. **Is there going to be a formal mechanism for tracking the assessment reports?**  
M. Jordan responded that he trusts the faculty to choose which outcomes to assess based on their expertise and to rotate the SLOs so that all SLOs are assessed.
- h. **When will the Rubric for Evaluation Assessment be introduced to the campus?**  
M. Jordan responded that he has already met with a couple of divisions; he is in the process of scheduling appointments with the remaining deans and their lead faculty.

**Existing Rubric - S. Rose** led the discussion of revisions to the existing rubric. The revisions will be incorporated into the rubric and brought back to the committee for final approval at the April 27, 2012 meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

**Recorded by:** Beverly W. Tillman