



**Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Minutes
November 27, 2017**

<u>Committee Chair(s):</u>		<u>Faculty:</u>	
Dr. Lan Hao, Co-chair	P	Roberta Eisel	P
Dr. Dave Kary, Co-chair	P	Dennis Korn	A
<u>Management:</u>		Becky Rudd	P
Claudette Dain	P	<u>Academic Senate/Faculty:</u>	
Dr. Dana Hester	P	Alfie Swan	P
Bob Hughes	P	<u>Supervisor/Confidential:</u>	
Dr. Martha McDonald	P	Marilyn Grinsdale	P
Dr. Lucinda Over	A	<u>Classified:</u>	
Dr. Robert Sammis	P	Cathy Day	P
Dr. Arvid Spor	P	Yueyi Huang	P
Dr. Maryann Tolano-Leveque	A	<u>ASCC:</u>	
Michael Wangler	P	Samantha Zeigler	A
P = Present; A = Absent			

I. October 23, 2017 meeting minutes review and approval
Minutes approved as submitted by consensus.

II. Accreditation Reporting

Roberta distributed a copy of a letter from the ACCJC dated November 20, 2017 (**Attachment One**). As part of the Commission’s restructure and reorganizing efforts they have created a portfolio system wherein each of their vice presidents will be assigned a portfolio of member institutions. The Commission’s vice presidents will be the primary liaisons for their designated institutions on an ongoing basis. The letter introduces Citrus College’s liaison and describes several ways this person may assist the colleges assigned to her. Citrus College’s vice president liaison is **Ms. Gohar Momjian**. Ms. Momjian will be Citrus’ key contact person at the Commission and also provide training for our staff as we move into the next cycle of our self-evaluation. When possible, our liaison will be on campus while a site visit is being conducted.

Having one sole liaison becoming familiar with Citrus (and the other colleges she is assigned to) may provide a greater level of consistency in reporting back to the ACCJC. The liaison is responsible for reviewing the same reports a visiting team chair is responsible for reviewing.

We are working on the Midterm report. Lan directed the committee’s attention to **Attachment Two – ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form: Annual Report Data, Institution-Set Standards** and **Attachment Three – 2017 Annual Report**.

Attachment Two – ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form: Annual Report Data, Institution-Set Standards –

This form is divided into eight sections and allows for three years of reporting (2014, 2015, and 2016) in five categories. One of the categories – *Stretch Goal* – is a new term. Clarifying this term creates an opportunity to reach out to Ms. Gohar, our appointed liaison. It's possible that the IEPI long-term (six-year) goal is also connected to the term *stretch goal*.

Roberta referred to page 14 in the *ACCJC Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions (Attachment Four)*. This page defines Standard I.B.3, but does not mention the term *stretch goal*. Lan pointed out the sub-point under the first bullet point:

- *In addition to the above metrics, institutions **must** demonstrate they are aware of, and use the key metrics used in the USDE College Scorecard.*

Lan checked the Department of Education College Scorecard (<https://goo.gl/hiEgNe>). At this website, the group viewed the *Graduation & Retention*. Lan questioned their methodology because the graduation rate shows Citrus College at 35% (below the National Median of 42%). Citrus has been recognized Nationally for our high graduation rates. The retention is correct at 67%. Both items are included within our 18 objectives and are being monitored.

We want to be very careful with our responses keeping in mind there was a Commission concern during our last site visit regarding not being aspirational when establishing our institution-set standards.

It was suggested that we populate the fields in the Midterm Report form with the goals taken from the 2017 Annual Report.

Our Midterm report is due in June, 2018. We need to have our evaluation process discussions documented. The documentation will be primarily from the IEC meeting minutes.

Roberta suggested that Arvid, Dave, Lan and herself meet to discuss this further and report back to the committee.

III. Institution-Set Standards (Attachment Five)

The discussion specifically focused around Institution-Set Standards for CTE *Licensure Pass Rates* and *Job Placement Rates*. There are two sections reserved for these areas on page two of the *Midterm Report Data Reporting Form (Attachment Two)*. These rates are also reported annually with our ACCJC annual report.

During our last accreditation site visit, it was observed by the team that the standards for these areas could be set to a more aspirational level (however, this observation was not mentioned as a concern in the team's final report). Our response was that we would address this at the program level through the program review process.

The individual CTE programs were approached and asked to review the historical pass rate data reported annually. The historical pass rates are generally much higher than the base standard. Faculty were then asked to consider setting more aspirational goals based on this data.

Most faculty agreed that the former standards (set by the Chancellor's Office) were too low. The new faculty-set standards are located in the far-right column. Some faculty were apprehensive about setting a higher standard thinking they might be penalized if the new standard is not met. There will be further discussions with faculty to clarify what the numbers mean in order to put them at ease and reassure them that there will not be punitive actions taken in the event the new goals are not met.

If, for example, the licensure pass rates do drop, the next action would be to discuss a funding solution to allow for new practices to ensure students develop the skills needed to promote an increase in pass rates and be competitive in the workplace.

Dave is anticipating the possible expectancy of a *stretch goal* requirement appearing on the 2018 annual report template. If this happens, there will be a very narrow window of time to consult with CTE faculty and have them set these additional goals. A possible solution could be a response to the ACCJC that the time-frame allotted is not sufficient to complete this section, but that moving forward we fully intend to comply.

IV. IEPI Year Four Indicators (Attachment Six)

The Chancellor's Office has approved six modifications to this year's reporting:

- Adjust the requirement to set a goal for the *Successful Course Completion* indicator from required to optional
Since we report this standard in the Annual Report, we will continue to set an IEPI goal for this indicator.
- Adjust the *Number of Degrees* indicator so that CTE and non-CTE award rates are listed separately
Number of Degrees is not the number of students (contrary to the ACCJC). We need to be mindful that even though the indicator language is the same, it carries a different meaning depending on the reporting agency.
- Add a Combined Number of Degrees and Certificates indicator and require colleges to set both a short-term (1 year) goal and long-term (6 year) goal
We need to clarify if they want number of degrees + certificates as a combined total. The IEPI website is not updated with the resources (e.g., FAQs etc.) to refer to for clarification.
- Require colleges to set a long-term (6 year) goal for the *Median Time to Degree* indicator
Time to degree was discussed at the last IRPC meeting. We need clarification of what is meant by *time to degree* so that the correct methodology can be used when establishing this goal.
- Require colleges to set a long-term (6 year) goal for *Completion Rate-Overall From the Scorecard*. Includes prepared and unprepared students.
- Require colleges to set short- and long-term *Transfer-Level Achievement* goals from at least one of the indicators for Math or English after one or two years
Citrus has recently implemented changes affecting the math and English enrollment. Through MMAP, most students have been placed in higher-level courses. We need to ensure that students also **successfully complete** these higher-level courses. It was suggested that we set conservative goals in year four.
Research has shown that with multiple measures, placing more students at a higher level yields similar success rates at the transfer-level courses. With this in mind, we can do a crude projection of the percentage of students who are able to complete

transfer-level math or English in a year. This will include the 2015-16 cohort (AB 705 was not in effect at this time).

It was agreed that a small workgroup should be formed for the purpose of establishing the goals for this requirement. The workgroup member volunteers are Lan Hao, Dave Kary, Arvid Spor, Michael Wangler, Alfie Swan, Roberta Eisel, and we will invite Gina Hogan.

The IEPI portal was displayed (<https://goo.gl/RZ1v2N>). It shows up to 2015-16 data only. It was noted that a component of Citrus' past method was to consider our historical goals when setting new reasonable goals for our college. If the year five indicators don't change drastically for year five, we will have an opportunity to revise the transfer-level achievement goal in 2019.

These goals have to be approved by Steering on May 7, 2018 and the BOT on May 15, 2018 in time to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by June 15, 2018. IEC does not meet again until February 26, 2018. It was suggested that the indicators be assigned to other relevant committees on campus to expedite the establishment of goals. Most of the other committees don't meet until late February or early March, 2018. It helps to have a wider vetting process for accreditation purposes. All sub-groups discussing their relevant indicators should be prepared to report their proposed goals at the April 30, 2018 IEC meeting.

The legal-size handout (part of Attachment Six) explains the indicator changes in greater detail and includes the data source. The data source gives us a clue of what is implied by the indicator language (e.g., The data source for *Completion of non-CTE* degrees is DataMart. This tells us that goals need to be set for number of degrees, NOT number of students earning degrees.).

V. Preliminary Results from the Instructional Taskstream Survey

This survey is ongoing. As of today there are 44 responses. A reminder will go out to prospective responders on Tuesday, November 28. This will also be discussed at the Academic Senate meeting on Wednesday, November 29.

So far, the overwhelming response is that TaskStream is moderately or very easy to use. These survey results will be good for accreditation evidence (i.e., evaluation of processes, etc.).

Meeting adjourned.

Remaining meetings:

February 26, 2018

March 26

April 30

May 21

Recording Secretary:
Jody Barrass
Administrative Secretary II, IRPE



November 20, 2017

Dr. Geraldine M. Perri
Superintendent/President
Citrus College
1000 West Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741-1899

Dear Superintendent/President Perri:

On behalf of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) I am pleased to announce the details of an important initiative that I believe will add value to your institution across a range of accreditation-related activities. We are deploying the professional experience of each of our vice presidents to more closely support a portfolio of member institutions; I will also support a small number of institutions in this capacity. In serving as the assigned liaison to your institution, each of us will bring a new level of experienced insight, personal availability, and consistent applications of our processes to your accreditation experience.

Effective with your receipt of this letter, Vice President Gohar Momjian is your assigned liaison with ACCJC.

Ms. Momjian has focused on accreditation through most of her 20+ years in higher education, including serving as Associate Vice Chancellor and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) at a California Community College. You can read more about her at <https://accjc.org/staff-directory>. You can contact her directly at gmomjian@accjc.org.

Your liaison will add value by:

- Answering questions about the interpretation or application of the ACCJC Standards or policies in the context of your institution.
- Providing advice on key aspects of a site visit.
- Helping to organize your institution's accreditation efforts through interactions with your ALO regarding roles and responsibilities, historical file management, committee structures, timelines for upcoming reviews, and report preparation.
- Bringing lessons learned from their portfolio colleges to ACCJC on emerging issues and complex challenges to ensure a uniform response to evolving practices and questions from members.
- Ensuring that the information provided to the Commission in support of their deliberations about your college is more complete and, as needed, enriched with nuance and context from their knowledge of your institution.
- Serving as the established point of contact between your institution and ACCJC for a broad range of issues. These may include suggestions for improving our processes, offering needed follow-up on complaints against the institution, discussing interactions about teams and site visits, and other matters that may arise.

Covered by your membership dues, your liaison will:

- Conduct an advanced Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) training with your accreditation team at your institution, approximately 18 months prior to a scheduled comprehensive visit.
- Take a lead role in selecting the team of peer reviewers that will conduct an evaluation, as informed by your liaison's growing acquaintance with your institution's history and character.

As this initiative becomes integrated with the visit calendar in the coming review cycles, and as far as feasible in terms of availability, your liaison will accompany the team to your institution at the time of the review. This should result in higher levels of consistency as the teams will have immediate on-location consultation with an experienced representative from our office. For multi-college districts, your assigned liaison will provide support for all of the colleges in the district. This will help to ensure consistency in support and planning. One or more additional vice presidents will be available for support when a large district undergoes a simultaneous comprehensive review.

The institution's responsibilities:

- Direct costs for the liaison to accompany the peer review team will be included in the final team visit invoice to the institution.
- Should the institution request additional visits from the staff liaison in addition to the advanced ISER training, you will be invoiced only for travel and housing-related costs.

In addition to providing support for their portfolio of institutions, each of the vice presidents facilitates a major Commission function. Vice President Droker supports the Policy and the Substantive Change Committees of the Commission. Vice President Momjian supports the Commission's Evaluation and Planning Committee and agency research functions. Vice President Reynolds oversees training and educational programming.

I am confident that this deployment of what we are calling the "portfolio model" will bring new levels of understanding, trust, and alignment of efforts between the Commission and your institution. I invite your continuing feedback as we make this initiative operational.

Sincerely,



Richard Winn, Ed.D.

RW/am

cc: Dr. Arvid Spor, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Accreditation Liaison Officer

ACCJC Midterm Report Data Reporting Form

ANNUAL REPORT DATA INSTITUTION-SET STANDARDS

STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION

(Definition: The course completion rate is calculated based on the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of student enrollments.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Stretch Goal	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Actual Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Standard and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

DEGREE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more degrees may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Stretch Goal	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Actual Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Standard and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

(Students who received one or more certificate may only be counted once.)

Category	Reporting Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Institution Set Standard	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Stretch Goal	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Actual Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Standard and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Difference between Stretch Goal and Performance	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Analysis of the data:	<input type="text"/>		

ANNUAL FISCAL REPORT DATA

Category

Reporting Year

General Fund Performance

	2014	2015	2016
Revenue	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Expenditures	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Expenditures for Salaries and Benefits	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Surplus/Deficit	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Surplus/Deficit as % Revenues (Net Operating Revenue Ratio)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Reserve (Primary Reserve Ratio)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Analysis of the data:

Other Post Employment Benefits

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) for OPEB	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Funded Ratio (Actuarial Value of Plan Assets/AAL)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Annual Required Contribution (ARC)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Amount of Contribution to ARC	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Analysis of the data:

Enrollment

Actual Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Analysis of the data:

Financial Aid

USED Official Cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD - 3 year rate)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Analysis of the data:

Attachment Three

This confirms that your 2017 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Geraldine Perri on 03/28/2017.
Below is a copy of the information submitted.



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

2017 Annual Report Final Submission 03/28/2017

Citrus College
1000 West Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741-1899

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Dr. Arvid Spor
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	626.914.8881
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	aspor@citruscollege.edu
5.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2016: 13,500 Fall 2015: 13,680 Fall 2014: 13,449
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses:	Fall 2016: 12,760 Fall 2015: 12,940 Fall 2014: 12,644
7.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements):	Fall 2016: 2,296 Fall 2015: 2,851 Fall 2014: 2,877
8.	Number of programs which may be fully completed via distance education:	Fall 2016: 11 Fall 2015: 13 Fall 2014: 17
9.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education :	Fall 2016: 2,987 Fall 2015: 2,497 Fall 2014: 2,403
10.	Do you offer Correspondence Education?	No
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2016: n/a Fall 2015: n/a Fall 2014: n/a

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer		
12.	a. What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	2016	2015	2014
		71.3 %	70.3 %	67 %
	b. Actual successful course completion rate:	70.3 %	69.3 %	69.2 %
13.	a. Type of Institute-set standard for degrees If Number-other or Percent-other, please describe:	Number-Other Number of students completing a degree		
		2016	2015	2014
	b. What is your Institution-set standard for degrees?	1,283	1,270	778
	c. Actual degrees awarded:	1,360	1,254	1,244
14.	a. Type of Institute-set standard for certificates If Number-other or Percent-other, please describe:	Number-Other Number of students completing a certificate		
		2016	2015	2014
	b. What is your Institution-set standard for certificates?	1,151	1,140	429
	c. Actual certificates awarded:	1,324	1,127	404
15.	a. Type of Institute-set standard for student transfers to a 4-year colleges/universities If Number-other or Percent-other, please describe:	Number of transfers		
		2016	2015	2014
	b. What is your Institution-set standard for student transfers to 4-year colleges/universities?	1,285	1,260	905
	c. Actual student transfers to 4-year colleges/universities:	1,123	1,234	1,082
16.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	2016: 7 2015: 8 2014: 0		
17.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	2016: 50 2015: 49 2014: 46		

Attachment Three

18.

Examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:

Program	Examination	Institution set standard (%)	2015 Pass Rate (%)	2014 Pass Rate (%)	2013 Pass Rate (%)
Cosmetology - Practical	state	70 %	97.75 %	88 %	93.5 %
Cosmetology - Written	state	70 %	83.25 %	60 %	87.25 %
Esthetician - Practical	state	70 %	89 %	99 %	93.75 %
Esthetician - Written	state	70 %	93 %	95 %	92 %
Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)	national	75 %	80 %	68 %	93 %
Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) - Practical	state	75 %	37 %	94 %	88 %
Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) - Written	state	75 %	76 %	74 %	100 %
Registered Dental Assistant (RDA) - Law/Ethics	state	75 %	100 %	93 %	86 %
Licensed Vocational Nursing (LVN)	state	75 %	85 %	85 %	95 %
Registered Nursing (RN)	state	75 %	89 %	87 %	80 %
Certified Nurse Assistant (CNA) - Written	state	75 %	n/a %	n/a %	100 %
Certified Nurse Assistant (CNA) - Skills	state	75 %	n/a %	n/a %	92 %
Certified Nurse Assistant (CNA)	state	75 %	100 %	100 %	n/a %

19.

Job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technical education) degrees:

Program	Institution set standard (%)	2015 Job Placement Rate (%)	2014 Job Placement Rate (%)	2013 Job Placement Rate (%)
Forestry/Wildland Resources	68 %	79.17 %	71 %	87.5 %
Accounting	68 %	65.5 %	65 %	81.5 %
Digital Media	68 %	85.7 %	14 %	50 %
Information Technology	68 %	71.5 %	n/a %	50 %
Medium & Heavy Truck Technology	68 %	71.4 %	n/a %	66.7 %
Automotive Technology	68 %	89.3 %	92 %	74.2 %
Drafting Technology	68 %	66.7 %	n/a %	66.7 %
Water Technology	68 %	100 %	86 %	89.4 %
Recording Arts/Commercial Music	68 %	76.8 %	54 %	77.6 %
Emerging Theatre Technology	68 %	100 %	75 %	60 %
Licensed Vocational Nursing	68 %	85.4 %	77 %	82.1 %
Dental Assisting	68 %	93.1 %	91 %	89.3 %
Child Development	68 %	79.5 %	63 %	56 %
Administration of Justice	68 %	79.6 %	73 %	82.4 %
Cosmetology/Esthetician	68 %	72.9 %	68 %	76.9 %
Public Works/Administration	68 %	100 %	75 %	n/a %

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Colleges were expected to achieve the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment by fall 2012. At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution. In completing the 2017 Annual Report, please refer to the revised Accreditation Standards adopted June 2014.

#	Question	Answer		
20.	Courses	2016	2015	2014
	a. Total number of college courses:	772	709	673
	b. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	764	709	661
21.	Programs	2016	2015	2014
	a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	54	52	53
	b. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	54	52	53
22.	Student Services and Learning Support	2016	2015	2014
	a. Total number of student services and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SSO/SAO implementation):	29	30	30
	b. Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	29	30	30

Other Information

23.	<p>Please use this text box to provide any comments regarding the data submitted in this report (optional, no limit).</p> <p>Question 18 - Citrus College program-level faculty are discussing the creation of aspirational institution-set standards which will be incorporated through the program review process.</p> <p>Question 18 - Certified Nurse Assistant pass rates no longer indicate separate written and skills proficiency as they did in 2015.</p>
-----	--

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.

I.B

3. The institution establishes institution-set standards⁸ for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11)

Evaluation Criteria:

- *The institution has established criteria and processes to determine appropriate, institution-set standards for student achievement, including course completion, program completion, job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates. The metrics both monitor and challenge institutional performance.*
 - *In addition to the above metrics, institutions must demonstrate they are aware of, and use the key metrics used in the USDE College Scorecard.*
- *There is broad-based understanding of the priorities and actions to achieve and exceed institution-set standards.*
- *The institution annually reviews data to assess performance against institution-set standards.*
- *If the institution does not meet its own standards, it establishes and implements plans for improvement which enable it to reach these standards.*

For institutions with a baccalaureate degree:

- *The institution has institution-set standards for the baccalaureate program and assesses performance related to those standards. It uses assessment to improve the quality of the baccalaureate program.*
- *Student achievement standards are separately defined and assessed for baccalaureate programs to distinguish them from associate degree programs.*

4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.

Evaluation Criteria:

- *Assessment data drives college planning to improve student learning and student achievement.*
- *Institutional processes are organized and implemented to support student learning and student achievement.*

Institutional Effectiveness

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

⁸ Glossary- Institution-Set Standards: Performance metrics and measures set by institutions for student achievement, both in individual programs and for institution-wide student achievement. (A useful example of Institution-Set Standards could be the three-year averages of student performance metrics and performance targets set above the averages.) Both the definition and the level of expected performance are appropriate for assessing achievement of institutional mission, for determining actions of improvement, and for analyzing institutional results in the context of higher education. Institutions assess student performance against locally set standards in order to determine institutional effectiveness and academic quality and to inform planning and action for continuous improvement.

Institution-Set Standards

Licensure Pass Rates

Division	Program	ISS Reported in 2017	2013	2014	2015	Faculty-Set New Standard
CTE	Cosmetology - Practical	70%	93.5%	88%	97.75	
	Cosmetology - Written	70%	87.25%	60%	83.25%	
Health Science	Certified Nurse's Assistant – Written	75%	100%	n/a	n/a	80%
	Certified Nurse's Assistant – Skills	75%	92%	n/a	n/a	80%
	Certified Nurse's Assistant	75%	n/a	100%	100%	80%
	EMT	75%	93%	68%	80%	80%
	Registered Dental Assistant - Practical	75%	88%	94%	37%	75%
	Registered Dental Assistant - Written	75%	100%	74%	76%	75%
	Registered Dental Assistant - Law/Ethics	75%	86%	93%	100%	75%
	Registered Nurse	75%	80%	87%	89%	
Vocational Nurse	75%	95%	85%	85%	80%	

Job Placement Rates



Division	Program	ISS Reported in 2017	2013	2014	2015	Faculty-Set New Standard
CTE	Architecture	68%	66.7%	n/a	66.7%	
	Automotive	68%	74.2%	92%	89.3%	
	Cosmetology/Esthetician	68%	76.9%	68%	72.9%	
	ITIS	68%	50%	n/a	71.5%	68%
	Medium/Heavy Truck	68%	66.7%	n/a	71.4%	
	Public Works	68%	n/a	75%	100%	75%
	Water Technology	68%	89.4%	86%	100%	91.8%
Natural & Physical Science	Wildland Resources	68%	87.5%	71%	79.17%	75%
Health Science	Dental Assisting	68%	89.3%	91%	93.1%	
	EMT	68%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Vocational Nursing	68%	82.1%	77%	85.4%	70%
Math/Business	Accounting	68%	81.5%	65%	65.5%	70%
Social & Behavioral Science	AJ	68%	82.4%	73%	79.6%	75%
	Child Development	68%	56%	63%	79.5%	68%
VPA	Recording Technology	68%	77.6%	54%	76.8%	68%
	Theatre	68%	60%	75%	100%	85%



The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

DATE: July 17, 2017

SUBJECT: Institutional Effectiveness, Framework of Indicators		Item Number: 2.7	
		Attachment: Yes	
CATEGORY:	Institutional Effectiveness	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
Recommended By:	 Theresa Tena, Vice Chancellor	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
Approved for Consideration:	 Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor	Action	X
		Information	

ISSUE: This item requests the Board of Governors' adoption of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Framework of Indicators pursuant to the requirements of Education Code section 84754.6.

BACKGROUND: Pursuant to California Education Code § 84754.6:

The Chancellor, in coordination with CCC stakeholder groups, fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature, and the Department of Finance, shall develop and the Board of Governors shall adopt a framework of indicators to measure the ongoing condition of a community college's operational environment focused at a minimum on the following:

- *Student performance and outcomes*
- *Accreditation status*
- *Fiscal viability*
- *Programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines*

As a condition of receipt of SSSP funds, each college shall develop, adopt, and post a goals framework that addresses at a minimum the four categories above.

By June 30, 2015 and before each fiscal year thereafter, the Chancellor shall post both of the following:

- *Annually developed system-wide goals adopted by the Board of Governors*
- *Locally developed and adopted college/district goals (**Background cont.**)*

RECOMMENDED ACTION: It is recommended that the Board of Governors adopt the Year-Four IEPI Framework of Indicators, which includes minor modifications to previous Frameworks.

(Background cont.)

For the last three years, the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative's (IEPI) Framework of Indicators process has provided an opportunity for California community college professionals to set short- and long-term aspirational goals for their institutions. It also helps colleges and districts strengthen cross-silo communication and engender a shared commitment to local institutional improvement and student success. Since its implementation, local participation in the Framework of Indicators goalsetting process has been engaged and punctual. Colleges and districts tend to identify more than the required number goals, and to date, all 113 colleges certified that they have adopted, developed, and posted their goals frameworks by the annual deadline, June 15.

A summary of the Year-Three Framework of Indicators goalsetting cycle¹: Although there were no new required goals in the Year-Three Framework the IEPI Advisory Committee's Indicators Workgroup added eight new optional college-level goals related to student performance and three district-level goals. The Board of Governors adopted the Year-Three Framework on November 14, 2016.

To provide helpful information about the Year-Three Framework, IEPI hosted a Framework of Indicators Portal webinar and two regional IEPI Indicators workshops. These trainings were well attended, with more than 100 California community college professionals participating in the webinar and 60 attending the regional workshops.

Preparation for the Year-Four Framework of Indicators goalsetting cycle: Congruent with previous goalsetting cycles, the development of the Year-Four Framework and goalsetting process has evolved through collaboration with community college partners and stakeholders. An important recommendation from IEPI's collaborators included seeking early adoption of the Year-Four Framework by the Board of Governors. An early adoption of the Year-Four Framework will allow colleges and districts added time to work together to adopt, develop, and post local goals.

ANALYSIS: In Year-Four, the goal of this effort is to continue to build upon metrics already collected and reported by colleges and districts. Colleges and districts will post locally developed and adopted goals using approved metrics by Friday, June 15, 2018. The Indicators Workgroup has proposed several modifications to the Framework for the Year-Four goalsetting cycle. Below is a summary of the proposed modifications.

Proposed Modifications:

- Adjust the requirement to set a goal for the *Successful Course Completion* indicator from required to optional
- Adjust the *Number of Degrees* indicator so that CTE and non-CTE award rates are listed separately
- Add a *Combined Number of Degrees and Certificates* indicator and require colleges to set both a short-term (1 year) goal and long-term (6 year) goal
- Require colleges to set a long-term (6 year) goal for the *Median Time to Degree* indicator
- Require colleges to set a long-term (6 year) goal for *Completion Rate-Overall*
- Require colleges to set short- and long-term *Transfer-Level Achievement* goals from at least one of the indicators for Math or English after one or two years

Attached is the proposed Year-Four Framework, which includes these suggested changes.

¹The Year-Three Framework of Indicators certification of completion forms were due on Thursday, June 15 2017. The CCCCCO received certifications from all 113 colleges at the time this agenda item was written.

College/District Indicator	Required/ Optional Indicator	Brief Definition
Student Performance and Outcomes		
Completion rate (Scorecard):	Optional	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2011-12 tracked for six years through 2016-17 who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes
• College-prepared	Optional	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was college level
• Unprepared for college	Optional	Student's lowest course attempted in Math and/or English was pre-collegiate level
• Overall	Required	Student attempted any level of Math or English in the first three years (Only the long-term goal is required)
Noncredit college choice	Optional	Each college may self-identify an indicator related to noncredit and provide a narrative of the result. This can, but is not required to be noncredit course success rate
College Choice Student Achievement (Basic Skills)	Required: at least one indicator must be selected for the college choice student achievement indicator	College must set a goal focused on unprepared students or basic skills students from Unprepared Completion Rate, Remedial Rate, or Transfer-level completion rate. College must identify which indicator has been chosen (Short- and long-term goals are required)
Remedial rate (Scorecard):	Optional	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years through 2016-17 who started first time in 2011-12 below transfer level in English, math and/or ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline
• Math	Optional	See above
• English	Optional	See above
• ESL	Optional	See above
Transfer-level achievement rate years 1 and 2	Required: at least one indicator must be selected for the college choice transfer-level achievement indicator	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2015-16 tracked for one and two years through 2016-17 who completed transfer-level math/English course (Short- and long-term goals are required)
• Math year 1	Optional	Completed transfer-level math in year 1
• Math year 2	Optional	Completed transfer-level math in year 1 or year 2
• English year 1	Optional	Completed transfer-level English in year 1
• English year 2	Optional	Completed transfer-level English in year 1 or year 2
CTE rate (Scorecard)	Optional	Percentage of students tracked for six years through 2016-17 who started first time in 2011-12 and completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred
Successful course completion (DataMart)	Optional	Percentage of students who earn a grade of "C" or better or "credit" in the fall term
Completion of non-CTE degrees (DataMart)	Optional	Number of associate degrees completed in 2016-17
Completion of CTE degrees (DataMart)	Optional	Number of CTE associate degrees completed in 2016-17
Combined degrees and certificates (DataMart)	Required	Number of associate degrees and Chancellor's Office approved certificate completed in 2016-17 (Short- and long-term goals are required)
Completion of certificates (DataMart)	Optional	Number of Chancellor's Office-approved certificates completed in 2016-17
Number of low-unit certificates	Optional	Number of non-Chancellor's Office-approved certificates completed in 2016-17
Number of CDCP awards	Optional	Number of Career Development-College Preparation awards completed in 2016-17

Number of students who transfer to 4-year institutions (DataMart)	Information Only	Number of students who transfer to a four-year institution, including CSU and UC, 2016-17 ¹
CTE Skills Builders	Optional	The median percentage change in wages for students who completed higher level CTE coursework in 2014-2015 and left the system without receiving any type of traditional outcome such as transfer to a four year college or completion of a degree or certificate
Median time to degree	Required	Median number of academic years needed to obtain an AA, AS or ADT (Only the long-term goal is required)
District participation rate	Optional	Percentage of 18-24 year olds living within district boundaries who are enrolled in at least one of the district's colleges
Accreditation Status		
Accreditation status	Required	Latest ACCJC action (status code)
		Fully Accredited - No Action (FA-N); Fully Accredited - Reaffirmed (FA-RA); Fully Accredited - Sanction Removed (FA-SR); Fully Accredited - Sanction Removed and Reaffirmed (FA-SR/RA); Fully Accredited - Warning (FA-W); Fully Accredited - Probation (FA-P); Fully Accredited - Show Cause (FA-SC); Fully Accredited - Pending Termination (FA-PT); Accreditation Terminated (T) (No longer used by the accrediting agency after July 2015); Accreditation Withdrawn (WD); Fully Accredited - Restoration (FA-RS); Initial Accreditation (IA); Re-Application for Accreditation (RE-AP) (Short- and long-term goals required)
Date of next visit	Optional	Informational item - no target collected.
Fiscal Viability		
Salary and Benefits	Optional	Salaries and benefits as a percentage of unrestricted general fund expenditures, excluding other outgoing expenditures
Full-Time Equivalent Students	Optional	Annual number of full-time equivalent students
Annual Operating Excess/(Deficiency)	Optional	Net increase or decrease in unrestricted general fund balance
Fund Balance	Required	Ending unrestricted general fund balance as a percentage of total expenditures (Short- and long-term goals are required)
Cash Balance	Optional	Unrestricted and restricted general fund cash balance, excluding investments
OPEB Liability	Optional	The percentage of the OPEB liability that the district's set aside funds represents, including both funds in a trust and outside of a trust and designated for this liability
Programmatic Compliance with State and Federal Guidelines		
Audit Findings	All Required	Modified opinion, material weaknesses, or significant deficiencies as identified in independent audited financial statements (Short- and long-term goals are required)
• Opinion for the Financial Statement		See above
• State Compliance		See above
• Federal Award/Compliance		See above
College Choice		
College Choice	Optional	Each college may self-identify an indicator related to any topic. Briefly explain the indicator and provide short-term and long-term goals. Goals must be presented as counts, percentages, or rates
<p>1 Metric dependent upon external variables (UC and CSU transfer admission policy) and therefore collected as information. Colleges are NOT expected to identify a goal. Each college is encouraged to engage in their local shared governance process to set goals (short term and long term) for the subsequent year.</p>		

Institutional Effectiveness Framework of Indicators

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Multi-Year Timeline: 2015 – 2017

Attachment Six

