

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR District Strategic Planning Council Minutes

Friday, October 25, 2019
CAADO – Room 140
12:00 pm – 2:25 pm

Present: Hussain Agah, Gregory Anderson, Stephen Ashby, Quinton Bemiller, Christopher Blackmore, Aaron Brown, FeRita Carter, Michael Collins, Kristine DiMemmo, Carol Farrar, Jennifer Floerke, Rebeccah Goldware, Monica Green, Terri Hampton, Wolde-Ab Isaac, Nathaniel Jones, Ruth Leal, Carlos Lopez, Susan Mills, Sheila Pisa, Thea Quigley, Abel Sanchez, Kathleen Sell, Mark Sellick, Robin Steinback, David Torres, Chip West, Launa Wilson, Lijuan Zhai

Guests: Kristine Anderson, Hayley Ashby, Samuel Lee, Sara Nafzgar

Absent: Melissa Bader, Kurt Faulknerloser, Jeannie Kim, Chris Nollette, Patrick Pyle, Gustavo Segura, Denise Terrazas, Jorge Zavala

I. Committee Business

- a. Approval of the September 20, 2019 Minutes – Carter/West moved that the committee approve the minutes of September 20, 2019. Motion carried
- b. Approval of the October 25, 2019 Agenda

II. Chancellor's Report

III. Discussion Items

Suggested revisions/changes from reviewing administration for the following sections are listed below:

Norco College

- a. Front Matter (Zhai)
 - Missing service area data? (In describing the institution, the introduction should include summary data on the service area in terms of labor market, demographic, and socio-economic data. ACCJC Guide p.21)
 - Page 19-simple description of ISS and how they were set?
 - ISS – make sure in ISER Standards: The institution demonstrates that it gathers data on institution-set standards, analyzes results on student achievement, and makes appropriate changes/improvements to increase student performance, educational quality, and institutional effectiveness. (p.23 of the guide).
 - ISS – make sure ISS is published (I.B.3: The institution establishes institution-set standards 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))
 - Pages 19-47 –Student achievement data. It seems they need trend data according to Appendix E of ACCJC guide. Just something to consider. Very nice charts!
 - Under each data chart – add Source.
 - Cohort groups – add veterans, DSPS, foster youth, special groups etc?
 - Missing licensure/certification exam passing rates? (no such programs?)

- Missing persistence from term to term? Use scorecard data?
 - Missing progression to next level - % of enrolling in the transfer level math/English? (see RCC)
 - Page 58 – functional maps- evidence not linked
 - Pages 61, 66 – evidences not linked.
- b. Standard I (Mills)
- Page 69 – How do institutional priorities relate to DSP?; Does the revised plan reduce the number of metrics?
 - Page 71 – and Strategic Plan?; Should there be a sentence or two on Guided Pathways?
 - Page 72 – Should we spell out Center for Student Success?
 - Page 76 – How do these standards relate to the targets set in the DSP?; How do these relate to Vision for Success?
 - Page 77 – How are these assessments used? What happens if standards aren't met?
 - Page 78 – Analysis seems to focus on software. How is achievement data used in planning and how does planning support student learning and achievement?
 - Page 79 – Has program review resulted in programmatic improvement?
 - Page 80 – incomplete sentence
 - Page 82 – Did the survey, assessment, and discussion lead to any changes?
 - Page 82 – How are the assessments & discussions leading to setting appropriate priorities?
 - Page 83 – How are the assessments & discussion leading to setting appropriate priorities?
 - Page 84 – Does this really address long-term?; Examples of accomplishment of improvements?
 - Page 88 – add “by the District Office of Educational Services”; add “Information Technology, Creative Services, and Educational Services.
- c. Standard II (Mills)
- Page 104 – May want to emphasize the use of student achievement data; How are part-time faculty included in these processes?
 - Page 105 – What about for PLO assessment processes?
 - Page 106 – How is NC supporting students in learning the knowledge and skills for college-level courses?
 - Page 111 – Include disaggregated DE data discussions; Are there objectives and/or targets from NC's strategic plan to mention here?; Are there items to include from NC's equity plan that address pedagogy and learning support services?
 - Page 113 – What about GE course work and GE SLOs – may want to add a sentence or two.
 - Page 116 – any assessments of GE SLOs and resulting improvements?
 - Page 118 – and assessed.
 - Page 121 – How does DE fit into program review process?; Continuing and community education not mentioned; Did the improvements lead to changes in student success?
 - Page 129 – Evaluation section?
 - Page 131 – Is this a policy or a process/procedure?
 - Page 133 – Could there be an example here?
 - Page 135 – Has there been an assessment including library on GE SLO for information competency?
 - Page 136 – Assurance of security, maintenance and reliability?
 - Page 143 – What about high school students in dual enrollment?; What about access for students with disabilities?
 - Page 146 – part-time
- Standard II (Pisa)
- Norco College ISER comments related to DE:

I only had one comment, page 111 in the last full paragraph it states that “the College employs...” It's not entirely accurate. Maybe something like this:

The District employs an Instructional Designer and an Educational Technologies Trainer who offer daily workshops/drop-in support for faculty on the Norco College campus, as well as online sessions.

- d. Standard III
- e. Standard IV
- f. Quality Focus Essay

Moreno Valley College

- a. Front Matter (Zhai)
 - Page 1-introduction, % change for the bottom page are wrong, should 13% for student enrollment, 13% for FTES, and 146% for completion.
 - Page 12 – enrollment by part-time full-time students – 6 years (currently 5 yrs, rest charts are 6 yrs).
 - Page 15 – ED enrollment, 6 yrs? Currently 5 yrs.
 - Pages 15-17-service area demo, labor market data, socio-economic data. Put all under one section? Demographic data was on page 7 and mixed with student demo data. Made it feel the community demo data is missing. Also on labor market data, include a job growth data in a table?
 - P20 – add some language on how ISS are developed.
 - P22-25 – course success rate by demo – 4yrs total, no trend to show. It seems they need disaggregated trend data according to Appendix E of ACCJC guide. The following sections showed 3 yrs. of data.
 - Page 36- ISS for transfer?
 - Pages 43-44 charts are unclear – re-do?
 - Missing student achievement data by delivery mode, cohort groups, site?
 - Missing persistence from term to term? (scorecard data?)
 - Missing student progression to the next level (% of enrolling in transfer level math/English)? See RCC.
 - Cohort groups – add veterans, DSPS, foster youth, special groups etc?
 - Format: tighten the layout of the data charts.
 - ISS – make sure in ISER Standards: The institution demonstrates that it gathers data on institution-set standards, analyzes results on student achievement, and makes appropriate changes/improvements to increase student performance, educational quality, and institutional effectiveness. (p.23 of the guide).
 - ISS – make sure ISS is published (I.B.3: The institution establishes institution-set standards 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))
 - Page 47-Organization of ISER – add more description to this section. Only has description for timeline.
- b. Standard I (Mills)
 - Page 63 – spacing; may also discuss vision, values, goals, etc.
 - Page 64 – Do we have more on the “updated” mission, vision, values and how it better reflects the colleges education purpose?; What courses are we talking about in light of AB705?; should resource development be included?; replace like with such as.
 - Page 65 – reference to scorecards or ongoing assessments?; what about math?
 - Page 66 – What needs are we talking about in light of AB705:/ wording; add the word “implemented”; outcomes; are the processes assessed? Decision-making, resource allocation, etc.
 - Page 67 – Evidence for mission, vision, values, review process?
 - Page 68 – Fix formatting
 - Page 69 – Could we provide evidence?; add “and monitoring of targets”; should we include setting and monitoring of equity goals aligned with Vision for Success; Title only?
 - Page 70 – Could we include more of an analysis here?

- Page 72 – How do the standards relate to the targets set in the DSP and Vision for Success?; Do we have an example for evidence?; What is methodology?
 - Page 73 – developmental
 - Page 75 – Has program review resulted in programmatic improvement?
 - Page 77 – Evidence?
 - Page 78 – Is there an example of how the data were used to include here?
 - Page 79 – Example of evidence?
 - Page 81 – How are resource requests reviewed and prioritized?; Need to discuss – is this needed as an improvement plan given the current work?
 - Page 82 – Need to discuss – is this needed as an improvement plan given the current work?
 - Page 87 – Other possibilities to include: review of institution set standards, presentations to Board – see for example, September 3, 2019.
 - Page 88 – Textbook costs are included on bookstore site.
 - Page 89 – Check to make sure that the quotes match in all documents; add “at least”; BP 3050 could also be included.
- c. Standard II (Pisa)
- Comments on MVC ISER regarding Distance Education (using draft 10-15-19)
 - Page 58 - Evidence of college policies related to distance education appears in Standard II.A.2. Is this the correct standard? Maybe II.A.7? Do you want to mention in this section on Distance Education that faculty are required to read the Guide to Best Practices in Regular and Effective/Substantive Contact and the Summary of Regulations before being assigned a DE class in their TA?
 - In addition, a DE checklist for online and hybrid classes was created and disseminated to Deans, Department Chairs, DE Committees and to faculty at Fall 2019 FLEX activities. This document is intended to ensure that faculty are including elements in their Canvas courses that meet Title 5 regulations and ACCJC standards.
 - Page 104, top paragraph - The District has employed training staff for Distance Education since at least 2001 and, beginning in 2017, one District Educational Technologies Trainer has been based at MVC. Responding to MVC’s surveys and input from the MVC Distance Education Committee, in Fall 2019 the District hired an Instructional Designer who also is partially assigned at MVC. These two staff members share time at MVC and provide their particular expertise on Canvas tools and how to implement them in ways that reflect best practices in online course design.
 - Somewhere in II.A.7 - Students registering for Distance Education courses are encouraged to review student-readiness modules on the District Distance Education website. Based on an analysis of first-time students’ success in Distance Education courses, a pilot of the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative’s (CVC-OEI) student orientation course, Quest for Success, was conducted in Fall 2019. Twenty-three faculty and over 1000 students participated in the pilot.
 - In Fall 2019, [Wellness Central](#), an online health and wellness resource for students was integrated into all MVC Canvas courses. This resource, exploring the six dimensions of wellness (emotional, social, physical, academic, financial, and spiritual) and identifying local mental health resources, was developed and made available through the CVC-OEI ecosystem.
 - Page 105 Analysis and Evaluation - Add Instructional Designer to the training and assistance for DE faculty.
 - Page 117 Library - A link to the MVC Library is built into all MVC Canvas courses’ main navigation menu to provide online students access to library resources.
- d. Standard III
- e. Standard IV
- f. Quality Focus Essay

Riverside City College

a. Front Matter (Zhai)

- Page 7-8: RCC student demographic data – enrollment only included headcount, sections by delivery mode, and FTES. Do we need to add disaggregated data? i.e. demo by age, ethnicity, gender? (The introduction should include enrollment data and trends (in tables or charts) disaggregated as appropriate to the institution’s mission and student population-ACCJC Guide to Institutional self evaluation improvement and peer review. P.21).
- Page 11 – Demographic data – should be service area demographics (In describing the institution, the introduction should include summary data on the service area in terms of labor market, demographic, and socio-economic data. ACCJC Guide p.21).
- Page 13 – Socioeconomic data – should be service area data. % of people living under poverty?
- Page 15 – Student achievement data Table 3 – add ISS (institutional set standards)? Be consistent with Table 4. Missing disaggregated achievement data by age, socio-economic status, and site?
- Page 21 – Table 8 (data source)
- Suggest to add a little more analysis to some data tables/charts (Tables 3, 4, 5 etc.)
- Institutional set standards (ISS) – brief introduction of ISS? I saw there is a brief intro on ISS (on p.36). Can we move to the front or repeat in the student achievement data section?
- ISS – make sure in ISER Standards: The institution demonstrates that it gathers data on institution-set standards, analyzes results on student achievement, and makes appropriate changes/improvements to increase student performance, educational quality, and institutional effectiveness. (p.23 of the guide).
- ISS – make sure ISS is published (I.B.3: The institution establishes institution-set standards 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))
- Pages 40, 41 – evidences not linked.

b. Standard I (Mills)

- Page 47 – works/ rephrase
- Page 48 – Guided Pathways framework is repeated twice in the sentence; Perhaps break into two sentences; Is it new or revised?
- Page 49 – Is this an issue?; add comma
- Page 50 – Can this be deleted?; spacing; lowercase; can this be deleted?; change what to do into *next steps*.
- Page 51 – change “are” to “is”
- Page 52 – Improve’s
- Page 53 – change from “will be” to “went”; remove “huge”
- Page 54 – add “level”; should this be written out again for the reader?
- Page 55 – Do we have examples of evaluating the efficacy of the strategies?; no hyphen?; Faculty Association; determines; hyphenated
- Page 56 – add “and”
- Page 57 – newsletters; remove word; Trustees; replace with “is”; Guided
- Page 59 – change “between” to “among”
- Page 61 – Does Caring Campus fit in this discussion somewhere?

c. Standard II (Mills)

- Page 81 – Should there be a discussion of course-level assessment and inclusion of part-time faculty?
- Page 82 – Discuss reduction in these areas?
- Page 83 – Should there be a discussion of the work of the AB705 Task Force, Communities of Practice, etc.?; All degrees and certificates have suggested pathways/course sequencing; time to completion is clear, etc.
- Page 86 – How is the college addressing achievement gaps in DE?

- Page 88 – Program Outline of Record?
- Page 89 – Should read “through faculty and discipline input in”
- Page 90 – Add a sentence on program specific outcomes; Did this happen? If so, make past tense; What is the role of the Assessment Committee?
- Page 91 – Should here be more discussion on ADTs?
- Page 94 – Remove the “we” and “our” phrases
- Page 95 – Continuing and community education?; insert comma; Should the focus be on prioritization here or more on improvements in program review to support student achievement and equity?; should read “include a focus on access, success, and equity”
- Page 103 – Should there be a discussion of G.P. and academic pathway engagement center support teams?
- Page 105 – What about engagement centers?; Equipment and materials?
- Page 108 – Incomplete sentence; Should be discussed more in the standard.
- Page 114 – How are the data used to improve services?
- Page 116 – Some of this belongs in the evidence section; Do we have overall assessment results to include in “Evaluation”; How do we prepare faculty advisors and educational advisors?
- Page 118 – EduNav
- Page 119 – informs?; Should we say something about MMAP; placement metrics for SLAM and STEM; placement survey efforts?
- Page 120 – RCC

Standard II (Pisa)

- RCC ISER comments related to DE
- Page 85, third paragraph: There should be mention, possibly in this paragraph about the daily training for faculty teaching DE courses, offered at RCC by Instructional Designers and Educational Technologies Trainers. These workshops and drop-in office hours provide faculty with assistance in using tools to ensure that faculty are maintaining regular and substantive contact with their students and meeting accessibility requirements. Also, RCC sent a contingent of faculty to the Online Teaching Conference in June 2019 for professional development in teaching DE courses.
- Page 102 - In the Library section there should be some mention like this: To support students who are taking courses in online or hybrid delivery modes, each Canvas course contains a link to library resources in its main navigation menu.

- c. Standard III
- d. Standard IV
- e. Quality Focus Essay

IV. Other

- Cancelled meetings: November 15 & December 13
- Next Meeting: December 6, 2019

Adjourned at 2:25 p.m