

Committee Chair: Ryan Pedersen

Recorder: BethAnn Stone

Committee Members Present: Scott Hubbard, Louie Giambattista, Tanisha Maxwell, Nicole Trager (AB2449-Zoom), Bill Bankhead, Cesar Reyes, BethAnn Stone, Tatiana

Pak, Abigail Thinn

Item #	Topic/Activity	Desired Outcome	Information Discussion Action	Lead	Notes
1.	Welcome and Public Comment	➤ Listen to our college community	I	Pedersen	<ul> <li>Ryan Pedersen welcomed the committee members to the meeting.</li> <li>Classified Senate Scholarship Crab Feed Fundraiser is March 9, 2024 and promises to be a great time, great food and all to raise monies for student scholarships.</li> </ul>
2.	AB2449	➤ Review and approval of AB2449 Teleconference Waiver Forms	I, D, A	Pedersen	• Nicole Trager submitted a Teleconference Waiver form to join and participate in the meeting via Zoom (per AB2449) for emergency circumstances. ( <i>T. Maxwell motioned, C. Reyes seconded; approved 7-0-0</i> )
3.	Agenda and Minutes from February 1, 2024	➤ Review and approval	A	Stone	<ul> <li>The Committee reviewed and approved the agenda with no corrections (S. Hubbard motioned, C. Reyes seconded; approved 8-0-0)</li> <li>The Committee reviewed and approved the February 1, 2024 minutes with two (2) corrections to item #4, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet – change "much" to "must" and add "automatically eligible" instead of "still eligible" (T. Pak motioned, B. Bankhead seconded; approved 5-0-3; A. Thinn, C. Reyes and B. Bankhead abstained)</li> </ul>
4.	District Updates	➤ District updates	I, D	Pedersen	Ryan Pedersen shared some information from the last Planning Coordinators meeting:     Discussed FMP enrollments and space projections. Also talked about growth rates – space utilization 60% F2F/Hybrid and 40% fully online when thinking about class utilization.      Updates to Tableau, new dashboard that allows filtering/disaggregation to department and faculty levels. Also new student performance tab with key performance indicators (KPIs).      CTE course/section flag for parameter/filter on all dashboards.



	President's Conference Room SS-409 & Via Zoom					
INST	ITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS				o Discussed Accreditation Midterm Report, and the annual and fiscal annual reports. Institution-Set Standards the committee will discuss during today's meeting. The Project Team will be talking to Academic Senate next week for review, feedback and approval on methodology for setting these standards. Also, the Program Review Project Team will attend the Academic Senate for review, discussion and approval of pause proposal.	
	<ul> <li>Timeline and Next Steps</li> <li>Distance Education Substantive Change Report</li> <li>U</li> <li>SU</li> <li>P</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Overview of first report draft, feedback form and process for college-wide review and input.</li> <li>Review of timeline and next steps</li> <li>Update to committee on recent submission of DE courses/programs and subsequent report to ACCJC.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Ryan Pedersen provided a brief update and overview of the 2024 Midterm Report and next steps according to the established timeline.</li> <li>There is only one (1) read for the Governing Board, which will occur at their August or September meeting with the other three (3) Colleges reports.</li> <li>We are still on track according to our timeline to go through our internal shared governance process by May.</li> <li>BethAnn Stone provided the committee with the changes and updates to the Accreditation webpages, including a new webpage for the Midterm Report.</li> <li>Ryan Pedersen provided the committee with the background and status of the Distance Education Substantive Change Report to</li> </ul>		
					ACCJC. This is required given the current number of courses that are online or distance learning.  • The ACCJC Annual Reports are due to the commission on April 12 <sup>th</sup> .  *The Governing Board will have one (1) read of the Midterm Report at their August/September meeting along with the other three (3) Colleges' reports. LMC is on track with the timeline to proceed through our internal shared governance review and approval process by May.  **There have been major changes and updates to the Accreditation webpages including a new webpage for the 2024 Midterm Report.  ***LMC is currently preparing the DE Substantive Change Report to ACCJC (due at the end of March) which is required given our current number of courses that are online.	



		Tresident's Conferen			****The ACCJC Annual Reports are due to the commission April 12th.	
REPO	REPORT-OUTS ON WORK/PROJECTS					
6.	<ul> <li>Institutional Effectiveness &amp; Goal Setting</li> <li>Package of Options with Data</li> <li>Presentation/Sharing with College for input</li> <li>Next Steps</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>▶ Review and discuss the package of options on how we report out Institution-Set Standards to ACCJC.</li> <li>▶ Committee to review and provide feedback on trial run of presentation/sharing with College.</li> <li>▶ Discuss and determine next steps.</li> </ul>	I, D, A	Pedersen/ Pak/ Bankhead	<ul> <li>ACCJC requires that each College set targets for Institution-Set Standards (floor and stretch/aspirational goals) for four (4) indicators – AA/AS Degree Awards, Certificate Awards, Transfer Rates, Course Completion Rates.</li> <li>The Project Team worked last semester to gather information on background, other institutions, and key questions. The team is now bringing two-to-three options to the committee for consideration, once accepted the team will go through the shared governance process for approval.</li> <li>Firstly, do we report on raw numbers or percentages? It was noted that degree and certificate awards should be reported as raw numbers. One option is to default to percentage whenever it is logical. Is it more effective to set our goals based on our demographics?         <ul> <li>Option #1: Looking at data over the last five (5) years and use the mean minus 1 standard deviation to set the floor and the mean plus 1 standard deviation to set the stretch/aspirational goal. It was noted upon review of the data for this option that certificate awards were lower than the proposed floor last year, and close to floor in last two (2) years. The committee discussed percentages versus raw numbers. It was noted that we had a 30% reduction in enrollments, so the percentages do appear to reflect well as the denominator is our unduplicated headcount. It was also stated that there is a decline in certificate awards whether it is in raw numbers or percentages. It was also commented that we should not be basing our methodology off of what makes the institution look "better".</li> <li>Option #2: Looking at data over the last five (5) years and use the lowest over the five years to set the floor and use the highest over the five years to set the stretch/aspirational goal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>CCCCO did recommend the use of standard deviations to set targets or goals.</li> </ul>	



Trestaent's Conference	CE KOOIII 55-409 & VIa ZOOIII
	• Do we want to set goals based on achievement or progress? Both
	of these options are based/centered on achievement.
	• The committee reviewed the data presentation from the P&IE
	Office, and asked if floor and stretch goals can shift every year?
	How would that work with program review that happens every
	two/three years? It was noted that ACCJC has us report on floor
	and stretch goals annually.
	• It was mentioned to tie the Institution-Set Standards into program
	review, as most initiatives do but how does the use of standard
	deviations keep it static for planning? A suggestion was to keep an
	internal standard on how we do the numbers not just for ACCJC
	but also program review.
	• The committee recommended that the Project Team give both
	options with a recommendation and a reason as to why we prefer
	the recommendation. Additionally, if it is only presented in raw
	numbers, be prepared to answer questions and/or provide an
	explanation as to why it is only presented in raw numbers.
	• The committee reached consensus on presenting both options, and
	recommending one with an explanation on preferred option.
	• The committee discussed whether to present in raw numbers or
	percentages. Following a straw poll of committee members, the
	committee showed some preference for reporting raw numbers
	versus percentages however, it was extremely close so the
	committee came to no real consensus. Abigail Thinn noted that
	students often look at percentages, especially when it comes to
	transfer rates.
	*The Institutional Effectiveness & Goal Setting Project Team will
	present both options discussed with the committee to the Academic
	and Classified Senates later this month for review and approval.
	The presentation will include a recommendation as well as the
	preferred option with an explanation as to why the
	recommendation is preferred.
	**The committee did not reach full consensus on whether to
	present in raw numbers or percentages however, the student
	committee member noted students tend to look at percentages more
	than raw numbers.
	man raw numbers.



## March 7, 2024 2:00 – 4:00 pm

## President's Conference Room SS-409 & Via Zoom

9.	Use of Survey Data	➤ Review and discuss updates and	I, D, A	Goff	Cesar Reyes shared the sample data flyer from the HOPE Survey
	Meeting Updates	spring 2024 projects/activities			results. The committee remarked how beautifully designed and
	Next Steps	Discuss and determine next steps			formatted the data flyer is.
	Trems suspe	1			The P&IE Office will work with Cesar and Christina to pull results
					from the HOPE, NACCC, CCSSE, and possibly SENSE surveys
					to create additional data flyers for highlights or key points from
					results.
					The P&IE Office will work with Tanisha Maxwell and the Project
					Team to develop data sheets and additional materials for the
					student panel at the April 1st College Assembly. Tanisha and Ryan
					will meet initially, then BethAnn will schedule a meeting with the
					Project Team.
					*The Use of Survey Data Project Team shared the new data flyer
					using the HOPE Survey results.
					**The P&IE Office and Tanisha Maxwell will work with the
					Project Team to design additional data flyers based on other survey
					results (NACCC, CCSSE, SENSE) for an activity following the
					student panel at the April 1st College Assembly.
10.	Program Review	➤ Review and discuss updates and	I, D, A	Trager	BethAnn Stone e-mailed the final Program Review Pause Proposal
	Meeting Updates	spring 2024 projects/activities			to Nicole Trager, Tanisha Maxwell and Scott Hubbard prior to the
	Next Steps	➤ Discuss and determine next steps			meeting.
					Nicole Trager and Scott Hubbard will present the pause proposal
					to the Academic Senate for review, feedback and possible
					approval.
					*The Program Review Project Team will present the Program
					Review Pause Proposal to Academic Senate for review, feedback
CANE	NIC COMMUNICATION/CONCENTUEN	CV DEDODEC			and possible approval at their March 11 <sup>th</sup> meeting.
	PUS COMMUNICATION/CONSTITUEN		l		*The Consension Decard will have a set (1) and 1 of the MCL
11.	Campus Communication/Constituency	Actions and Notable Items to			*The Governing Board will have one (1) read of the Midterm
	Reports a. Academic Senate	Report from Planning Committee to Constituency; or from			Report at their August/September meeting along with the other three (3) Colleges' reports. LMC is on track with the timeline to
	a. Academic Senate b. Classified Senate	Constituency to Planning			proceed through our internal shared governance review and
	c. SGC	Committee			approval process by May. There have been major changes and
	d. TLC	Committee			updates to the Accreditation webpages including a new webpage
	G. TEC				for the 2024 Midterm Report. LMC is currently preparing the DE
					Substantive Change Report to ACCJC (due at the end of March)
					which is required given our current number of courses that are
L	l .	l .	L	I	is required given on convent number of courses mut are



March 7, 2024 2:00 – 4:00 pm

Warch 7, 2024 2:00 – 4:00 pm				
President's Conference Room SS-409 & Via Zoom				
12. Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.	online. The ACCJC Annual Reports are due to the commission April 12th.  **The Institutional Effectiveness & Goal Setting Project Team will present both options discussed with the committee to the Academic and Classified Senates later this month for review and approval. The presentation will include a recommendation as well as the preferred option with an explanation as to why the recommendation is preferred. The committee did not reach full consensus on whether to present in raw numbers or percentages however, the student committee member noted students tend to look at percentages more than raw numbers.  ***The Use of Survey Data Project Team shared the new data flyer using the HOPE Survey results. The P&IE Office and Tanisha Maxwell will work with the Project Team to design additional data flyers based on other survey results (NACCC, CCSSE, SENSE) for an activity following the student panel at the April 1st College Assembly.  ****The Program Review Project Team will present the Program Review Pause Proposal to Academic Senate for review, feedback and possible approval at their March 11th meeting.			
Spring 2024 Meeting Dates: April 4 <sup>th</sup> , May 2 <sup>nd</sup>				