# IIC Notes for the November 14th, 2023 Meeting

Members Present:Alexander Brown, Aline Gregorio, David Grossman, Jeanette Rodriguez, Jennifer Merchant, JP Gonzalez, Michael Gieck, Marcia Foster, Roman De Jesus

Guest(s): None
Public comments/Announcements: IIC Chair introduced new member Marcia Foster who is replacing Nick Arman on the committee.

## Agenda

1. Faculty Co-Chair
	1. Manager co-chair encouraged faculty members to email their interest in the co-chair position. IIC has been without a faculty co-chair during the fall term.
2. Mission Statement Update
	1. Chair informed the committee that the President requested that the College’s proposed mission from Fall 2022 be presented to the NOCCCD Board of Trustees (BOT) for a vote of approval. Previously, the IIC Co-chairs presented the updated mission statement and core values at the 2/14/2023 meeting. The BOT voted to affirm the core values, but did not vote on the mission. They expressed concern with the language of the mission, in particular the phrase “ we dismantle oppressive institutional structures to achieve educational justice”.
	2. The BOT meeting would occur later in the day, and the presentation will be lead by Accreditation Steering Committee member Bridget Kominek. Bridget was the lead writer on Standard 1 of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) the College is currently finalizing. Chair shared the presentation which highlighted that:
		1. Faculty Senate, Associated Students, and President’s Advisory Council voted to request the BOT vote on the mission “as is”
		2. That the revised mission was aligned with the new statewide planning document, *Vision 2030.*
		3. That the revised mission was also aligned with the updated 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards which include a requirement that an “institution’s mission articulates its commitment to ensuring equitable educational opportunities and outcomes for all students”. The presentation also highlighted that the “review criteria” for this standard included a need for the mission to align with “ACCJC’s Policy on Social Justice”.
3. Institution Set Standards
	1. The Chair began a discussion of a report highlighting the College’s performance on its recently updated Institution Set Standards. The Chair shared the most recent report through email on October 23, 2023. In lieu of the 10/24/2023 meeting, the committee members were asked to review the report and consider the following guiding questions:
		1. Are there any results that surprised you?
		2. Are there results that you think are important to share with the rest of the College?
		3. Are there any Institution Set Standards or Aspirational Goals that we should consider adjusting up or down?

* 1. The group discussed the report and the guiding questions. Of note where the term-to-term retention/persistence rates at the College. A member noted that in discussions around enrollment, there seems to be a de-emphasis on retention. If the College increases the number of students it retains, there would be less pressure to recruit new students. The standards that were related to Career Technical Education (CTE) were also discussed, as the College’s performance on these metrics was commendable.
	2. A committee member noted that the increased number of online offerings may be a reason to breakout course success and retention rates by modality.
	3. The group discussed the “successful enrollment” metric, which measures the number of applicants that are converted to registered students. The rates were below the set standard of 20.5%. Members discussed some of the limitations of how the College currently engages in outreach and onboarding. Some smaller programs are able to follow-up with applicants to support their onboarding processes, but this is much more difficult collegewide.
	4. A member suggested that the report include comparisons to regional or state rates
	5. A discussion was also had about the nature of setting ISS and aspirational goals. A member noted that given the nature of the students we serve, we should be thoughtful about how we contextualize some of these rates.
1. IIC’s Role in the Annual Program Review Update Process
	1. The chair shared that programs were finalizing their Annual Program Review Updates. These forms include reflection questions about programs’ performance on the course success and retention Institution Set Standards, as well as the program’s performance on one of the College’s Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO).
	2. The chair noted that in a recent Program Review and Planning Committee (PRPC) meeting members of the committee suggested that IIC review the two sections on ISSs and ISLOs. The chair shared that he and the PRPC chairs discussed the idea of having IIC review a random sample of APRU submissions and identify trends/highlights and share those with the campus.
	3. A member of IIC expressed their concern with this process. They shared their misgivings about reviewing this data on the APRU form and insisted that this review should only be done on the comprehensive review which occurs every four years. They shared that this would be a “time suck” for faculty, and that reading/reviewing a sample would not be sufficiently meaningful.
	4. The chair suggested that the committee review the APRUs in lieu of some spring meetings. A member suggested that they could each review up to 10 APRUs and discuss as a group.
	5. No decisions were made about this issue, but the chair indicated that they would identify how many APRUs they would need to review and share this discussion with PRPC

**Next Meeting : November 28, 2023**