



Institutional Integrity Committee Minutes

Co-Chairs: Michael Mangan (F), Joseph Ramirez (M) **Members:** Jessica Alcala (F), Michael Gieck (C), Juan Pablo Gonzalez (F), Lisa McPheron (M), Kim Orlijan (F)

Student Representative: None Present.

Guest: Danielle Fouquette (F), Rayaam Mamoon (S)

Recorder: Emma Hangué (C)

Members Absent: Amber Borja (S), Shauna Fisher (C), Michelle Gomez-Velazquez (F), David Grossman (M), Elaine Lipiz Gonzalez (M), Karla Lopez (S), Ian McHugh (F)

C = Classified; F = Faculty, M = Manager, S = Student

HOUSEKEEPING

Meeting time of order: 1:04pm

1. Welcome

2. Introductions

3. Agenda

- a. No changes.

4. Meeting Notes

- a. ****Note:** The approval of the March 23rd minutes will be handled during our next meeting when we have more participants on the committee in attendance.

5. Public Comment

- a. None.

6. Announcements

- a. Some member terms are ending in Spring 2021
 - i. Mike Mangan
 - ii. Jessica Alcala
 - iii. Michelle Gomez-Velazquez
- b. We will also check with Ian McHugh to see if he will continue on for the following year.
- c. Update on Committee Website:
 - i. Lisa McPheron provided an update on the new developing website for committees. Jazmin Zuniga has built out a landing page for the website. The goal is to have a few committees developed out. We will be able to list

IIC: The Institutional Integrity Committee regularly evaluates and makes recommendations on the College's policies, processes, practices, procedures, and publications in order to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the College's planning and decision-making process and its alignment with the College's mission.

Rosters, meetings, agenda schedules, etc. Trying to get things ready for a draft by May to the board.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Annual Report to Faculty Senate

- a. May 20th meeting of the Faculty Senate. Plan to have the draft of our written report to the committee which will then be presented to the Faculty Senate.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Annual Program Review Update Review Update Review (Activity)

- b. Joe continued to lead the group in reviewing Annual Program Reviews. Committee members were broken into breakout rooms to analyze responses from the Annual Program Reviews.
- c. **The Excel Spreadsheet link:**
https://fullcolledu-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/g/personal/jramirez_fullcoll_edu/EcH-ex7Grk9Kv06TymQLsLYBM-MBE2ZUnw1UUgXaDI9ysQ?e=hGPKdU
- d. **The APRU's Link:**
<https://teams.microsoft.com/#/school/files/General?threadId=19%3A4e971a836fb c40c78e4117cb1f2f8ff7%40thread.tacv2&ctx=channel&context=Instructional%2520APRU's&rootfolder=%252Fsites%252FPRC2021103%252FShared%2520Documents%252FGeneral%252FInstructional%2520APRU%2520Forms%252FInstructional%2520APRU's>
- e. **Initial Feedback/Comments/Observations from the Annual Program Review Update Activity**
 - i. What is the intention of the questions/exercise? What does it mean to compare? (Compare what exactly?)
 - ii. The committee noticed that there were inconsistent approaches to the data and their responses. Some included more data than what was provided, some did not. Some brought forth analytical data and proof to explain their answers to certain questions, and others wrote shorter answers without providing any clear examples to back their findings. The committee feels that perhaps the questions should be more direct, or explained better so that there isn't such a wide-range gap of inconsistency of answers to questions. Some feel that maybe the questions need to be a bit more focused.
 - iii. Another suggestion that was brought up was adding a glossary.
 - iv. Some feel that providing a sample answer might be helpful in order to show what type of information is being looked for.

IIC: The Institutional Integrity Committee regularly evaluates and makes recommendations on the College's policies, processes, practices, procedures, and publications in order to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the College's planning and decision-making process and its alignment with the College's mission.

Tuesday, April 13, 2021

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Via ZOOM

- v. Maybe having groups ask what is contributing to success, and what would help to contribute to even *more* success might be a more helpful way to see what is actually working, as opposed to having programs focusing on what is not working, and focusing on the negative and why some areas are failing.
- vi. Some on the committee also noticed that the ISLO's are a little fuzzy. Some feel that our ISLO data, along with eLumen is a mess.
- vii. In the last 3 years, the amount of programs who have assessed their SLO's is under 60%.
- viii. Some believe that the Annual Update should be more process-oriented, as opposed to looking at the data itself.
- ix. The new ISLO's haven't been in place for even a year, but according to Accreditation standards we need to continually assess and see where we fall with our ISLO's. Some feel that there is very little awareness on the ISLO's.

OTHER TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

1. None.

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 (Via Zoom)

Agenda and Minutes: Greg Schulz, Jean Foster, Nitzya Hamblet, Rodrigo Garcia, Melisa McLellan, José Ramón Núñez, Gilbert Contreras, Emma Hangué, Joe Carrithers, Kim Orlijan

IIC: The Institutional Integrity Committee regularly evaluates and makes recommendations on the College's policies, processes, practices, procedures, and publications in order to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the College's planning and decision-making process and its alignment with the College's mission.