Evergreen Valley College  
IEC Committee Meeting Minutes  
February 22, 2016

[Note: these minutes are reported in narrative format to reflect discussion of Institutional Set Standards, which constituted the majority of the meeting on this date.]


Absence: Sheryanne Lim (sabbatical), Chris Ratto, Ralph Nichols, Octavio Cruz.

Agenda item: Accreditation Update-Institutional Set Standards

Discussion facilitated by Bob Pacheco

Introduction: Originally Accreditation was peers looking at peers—e.g. CA Nursing program evaluating IL Nursing program. 20th c. education was more for the elite, and now we have moved to a model of education for all.

Institution Set Standards (ISS) sets a floor, a level of performance below which we would be unhappy, need to take action to correct. Institutional Effectiveness = Academic Quality. The Federal government will not give us money if we don’t meet standards. The CA government also says we have to set “stretch goals,” rates to aspire to. We have to think about what they are asking us to do and WHY. Can’t approach it like a tax form.

BP reads from hand-out (Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement): “The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating [sic] resources, and to make improvements.”

Today we are going to work on setting an ISS for Successful Course Completion, defined as student receiving a ‘C’ or better or a Pass in a course (different from Course retention, which includes ‘D’ and ‘F’s). If completion rate is 60% and retention rate is 80%, then 20% need intervention. How do we do better for students, given that English may be their second language, they may not have bus fare to get to school, etc.?

First steps are Looking at Date with these approaches: 1) “I wonder . . . “ (thinking about what the data means), and 2) thinking collectively “What if . . .” (what can we do to improve).

Look at data collected and presented by Ying-Fang Chen: (hand-out) Course Success Rate (Fall) for each of last 5 years + 5 year average for EVC, State of CA, and Peer institutions (Skyline, Irvine Valley, Santa Monica, Pasadena, and Foothill). 5-year average is to avoid giving too much weight to anomalies, and also for tracking students. State average is important comparison. Peer institutions is so we can get ideas about how to improve.

Page 1—numbers are very stable—not much change over time OR between schools. But what could we do better? We hover around 70% (5 year average at EVC). How did we get 80% as our goal (what was stated in previous document as our ISS)? Answer: it was a misunderstanding of the definition of the term! We thought we were setting stretch goal, when, in fact, it was meant to be a “floor.” We will proactively tell the Accreditation visiting team this. And, in the meantime, set a more realistic number.

Respectfully submitted by Note Taker, Liza Kramer
“I wonder” questions: How can we get more students to succeed? What’s happening when they don’t make it? Also, how is data gathered?

Need to find correct balance between Access and Success. How do we build pathways for students to be more successful? E.g. do we need to make certain levels of English a prerequisite for Economics or Political Science?

MG: How are faculty communicating, “we want you to succeed”—100%?

BP: advise to drop if student needs more preparation?

FM: Do all students KNOW what support services are available to them?

BP: Invitation to office hours is not always sufficient. May be culturally embarrassing to say to professor, “I don’t understand.” Or obstacle may be technology: how can student not need to write their essay using their phone.

MG: What if Deans of departments were also Deans of Retention/Student Success? Bring two houses together.

LA: What if we had more space to think together? Learner spaces or Maker Spaces, a no-threat zone?

BP: Learn about what is happening with your students outside of classroom.

LM: Go to instructors who have higher success rates, and ask, “What do you do?”

BP: Students have such different communication styles—superfast, 160 characters/minute. Ask: How do you want to learn? How to communicate with them? Are we nimble enough? College degree might not be worth as much now as before.

AB: Check in with students—How is your experience at EVC? Including face-to-face. And then DO something with the results!

Can we create flex days to talk about these issues? IEC doesn’t DO the work, but sparks the conversations for other committees to take up.

What should we think about in setting floor?

YFC: Campus should be comfortable with it.

FM: Don’t want to go below State level.

BP: Because of fluctuations, we need to set it low enough that we know if we go below, it really MEANS something. (Obama has EVC data on White House webpage. Focus on data is not going away.)

62.19=90% of State average; 65.6%=95% of State average. Let’s set it right between these: 64%?

IEC votes and approves recommending 64% Course completion as our ISS.

LA: I’ve got to take this to the Academic Senate, and they will ask, “Why so low?”

Next time we will work on setting ISS for Transfer. This is not required, but it will be good and look good for us to set a standard for this—something to work on.

Respectfully submitted by Note Taker, Liza Kramer
What percentage of students entering EVC identify transfer as their goal? 35% at time of application.  
Mira Costa said 70%.

PP: Every time students register again, they have to identify goal again. How often does that goal change?

REQUIRED ISS are: Course Completion, CTE licensure, and employment success.

Minutes from 11/16/15, 12/7/15, and 2/1/16 will be sent out via email for corrections and approval.

Next meeting: 2/29/16.