



Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)

MINUTES

March 23, 2026 – CI 159 and Zoom (hybrid)

Committee Members:

Committee Co-Chairs:		Academic Senate President:		Guest:	
Lan Hao	P	Lisa Villa	P	Lisa McPheron	P
Dan Volonte	P	Faculty:		ISER Co-Chair Guests:	
Management:		Catie Besancon	P	Nichole Ary	P
John Albert	P	Anh Nguyen	A	Fred Diamond	P
Jack Beckham	P	Becky Rudd	P	Wade Ellis	P
Eric Calderon	P	Supervisor/Confidential:		Brenda Fink	P
Jeremy Clark	P	Rosario Garcia	P	Senya Lubisich	P
Claudette Dain	A	Classified:		Suzanne Martinez	P
Dana Hester	A	Jennifer Blackburn	P	Kim Orlijan	P
Kim Orlijan	P	Yueyi Huang	P	Michelle Plug	P
Richard Rams	A	Trevor Tolliver	P	Bala Sethu Raja	P
Gerald Sequeira	A	ASCC:		Tommy Reyes	P
Ty Thomas	A	Aimee Ortiz-Ramirez	P	Maryann Tolano-Leveque	P
				Anna Villeneuve	P

1. Introductions

All group members, including the ISER co-chairs who were present, introduced themselves and their roles at the college.

2. February 23, 2026 Meeting Minutes Review

The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Accreditation Update and Welcome ISER Co-Chairs!

The college’s accreditation team is kicking-off the evidence gathering phase of the ISER writing process. An ISER group has been formed consisting of faculty and management staff. The group is divided into nine teams (one or more teams for each standard). Each team consists of two individuals (co-chairs) - one faculty and one management co-chair. Due to accreditation being a standing agenda item for IEC, all ISER team co-chairs were invited to attend the remainder of the spring 2026 IEC meetings.

In addition to visiting IEC, the ISER team co-chairs may be visiting other shared governance group meetings to consult with them on deciphering the best evidence to use based on the group’s area of focus.

- **GOAL:** Compile a complete, concise list of the most compelling yet varied pieces of evidence to include with the ISER.
- **GOAL:** Make it as easy as possible for the visiting team to find the evidence being referenced. This includes pinpointing a specific page and/or highlighting exact language in a piece of evidence.

- **GOAL:** Evidence being cited needs to be up-to-date at the time the ISER is completed (e.g., APs/BPs cited while in the midst of a shared governance vetting period – the final approved version needs to be included as the evidence).
- **GOAL:** Evidence needs to be accessible.

The accreditation leadership team (Dana, Catie, Dan and Lan) will guide and support the ISER teams in any way needed. Throughout this agenda item discussion, standard team co-chairs were coached on ways to gather effective evidence. Local AI resources are available.

When the time comes to write the narrative portion of the ISER, a style guide approach will be implemented in order to ensure a consistent tone throughout.

Timeline:

- Spring 2026: Evidence gathering period
- Fall 2026: ISER writing term
- Spring 2027: ISER will be presented to the various shared governance groups
- Fall 2027:
 - ISER submitted for board of trustees approval
 - Submission to ACCJC
- Fall 2028: Peer review team will visit the college

4. Review of the Integrated Planning Manual: Committee Assignments

The [Integrated Planning Manual](#) is published on the college’s website. Ideally, it should be updated every two years. It needs to accurately reflect the college’s planning processes.

- The integrated planning model (page 7 of the manual) is meant to be a visual representation showing the connections and flow of the college’s planning processes. This page, as well as the entire publication, needs to be accessible.
- Pages 11-18 and 20-25 of the manual are assigned to the most logical shared governance committees for review (e.g., page 14 – Sustainability Plan is assigned to the Physical Resources Committee).
- The review is not to check the progress of an existing plan, but rather the accuracy of current planning process (e.g., is the purpose, process, timeline, etc. accurate?).
- The proposed deadline for the shared governance committees to submit their reviewed pages, including any edits, to IRPE is May 22, 2026.

5. 2026 ACCJC Annual Report

The college is required to submit the ACCJC Annual Report each spring. Prior to today’s IEC meeting, the draft report had been partially populated with the past two reporting years of previously submitted factual data and institutional-set standards (ISS) along with the not yet reported data and ISS. Prior year reports appear on the [Citrus College accreditation webpage](#).

Q5. Total unduplicated headcount enrollment for the last three years:

2022-23:	16045	2023-24:	16051	2024-25:	17044
----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------

- The numbers apply to headcount only (not enrollment). **Includes** noncredit headcount.

Q6. Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in **degree applicable credit courses** for the last three years:

2022-23: 2023-24: 2024-25:

- **Does not include** noncredit.

Q7a. Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in **distance education** in the last three years:

2022-23: 2023-24: 2024-25:

- Students who have taken at least one distance education class in the academic year.

Q7d. Total unduplicated **degree-applicable** headcount enrollment in **distance education** in the last three years:

2022-23: 2023-24: 2024-25:

Q7g. % of all students that took at least one **degree applicable** distance education course:

2022-23: 2023-24: 2024-25:

- This equates to one out of every three students who have taken at least one degree applicable distance education course.

Q7h. % of all **degree applicable** distance education courses offered online:

2022-23: 2023-24: 2024-25:

- Of the total number of degree applicable courses offered at Citrus College, what percentage of those courses had at least one section offered online during the applicable academic year?
 - A large number of performing arts, auto, and CTE courses are only offered in-person.
 - In 2024-25, out of the 832 courses offered, 305 of those courses offer at least one distance education section.

Q9b. The current **graduation rate** per the US Education Department College Scorecard is **35%**

Q9c. The current **transfer rate** per the US Education Department College Scorecard is **28%**

- Questions Q9b and/or Q9c **do not** take into consideration students who do not have a goal to graduate or transfer.
 - Students attend Citrus College with various end-goals in mind.
 - The “storytelling” aspect of data reporting may explain the circumstances of these low percentages.

Q11b. Please review and score your institution’s website on the Rubric for Effective Institutional Outcome Transparency

- There are four scoring categories wherein institutions may rate themselves: 0 (zero) (being the least desirable score) to 2 (being the best score). Citrus College gave itself an overall score of 7/8.

Rubric for Effective Institutional Outcome Transparency			
Data Accessibility	0	1	2
	There is no prominent link on the home page of the college website, however the college does have a public page that contains student achievement data.	There is a link on the home page of the college website, but it is either not clear and/or the link title is not intuitive and approachable for a student who is exploring the college.	There is a link on the home page of the website where the college deliberately invites students to explore institutional outcomes. The link is intuitively named such that students and parents would be compelled to explore the information.
Recency and Context	0	1	2
	Published data is more than three years old.	Published data are between two and three years old. There is some explanation of why the student achievement data are present, what it being measured, and how it is used by the college.	Published data are less than two years old, contextualized, labeled, and annotated to facilitate understanding by appropriate users. Any presented metrics are accompanied by cohort descriptions. Language used in the presentation of data is at the average public reader level.
Disaggregation	0	1	2
	Student Achievement data is not disaggregated as appropriate for the College mission.	Some student achievement data is disaggregated; however, it is either minimal or inconsistent with the College mission.	Student Achievement data are meaningfully disaggregated as appropriate for the College mission
Reflection and Storytelling	0	1	2
	There is minimal to no reflection by the college regarding the student achievement results presented in the data.	There is some reflection on the meaning of the data. Student achievement data is accompanied by some institutional storytelling about how the College is addressing the published achievement information.	Student achievement data are meaningfully interpreted and includes institutional reflection on how well the college is doing with respect to the presented information. The reflection conveys a desire to continue to improve in the interest of equitable student achievement. The data are accompanied with institutional storytelling about both student achievement/learning outcomes and the effort the college continues to make in the interest of equitable student achievement. Storytelling is accompanied by contact information for users to engage, ask additional questions, or seek further clarification.

- The college gave itself a score of 1 under Reflection and Storytelling because the team felt that our data is more factual rather than providing the nuances of the “why” factors.
- The accompanying narrative will be:
 “Citrus College remains committed to continuous improvement in data transparency. Data review and discussions have always been integral to committee meetings such as Enrollment Management, Institutional Research and Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, among others. The publicly available student achievement data are accessible, current, and aligned with the College's five-year Strategic Plan measurable objectives, providing longitudinal trend data across comprehensive metrics. To strengthen our efforts, we are prioritizing enhancements in reflection and storytelling to better contextualize the data. We plan to incorporate more meaningful narratives and equity-focused reflections. We also plan to update the website so that the student outcome data will be more prominently highlighted online.”

The next section of the annual report includes the **institution-set standards (ISS)** (beginning with Q12). Data for the two past and the current reporting years are required. There are three parts for each ISS: **1) Floor** – the least acceptable; **2) Aspirational** – what the college hopes to achieve; **3) Actual** – the factual data being reported.

The floor and aspirational goals were pre-set in association with the 2021-26 Strategic Plan measurable objectives.

Q12. Course Completion:

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
12a. List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for successful student course completion rate:	72 %	72 %	72 %
12b. List your stretch goal (aspirational) for successful student course completion rate:	75 %	75 %	75 %
12c. List the actual successful student course completion rate:	75 %	76 %	79 %

Q13. Certificates [number of students who earned at least one certificate]

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
13b. List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for certificates:	1400	1400	1400
13c. List your stretch goal (aspirational) for certificates:	1620	1636	1653
13d. List actual number or percentage of certificates:	1468	1382	1431

Q14. Associate Degrees [number of students who earned at least one associate degree]

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
14a. List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for associate degrees:	1400	1400	1400
14b. List your stretch goal (aspirational) for associate degrees:	1506	1521	1536
14c. List actual number or percentage of associate degrees:	1327	1222	1306

Q13 and Q14: Due to the decrease in enrollment, a residual effect of the pandemic, the actual numbers reported are lower than the aspirational goals which were set partly in conjunction with the 2021-26 Strategic Plan measurable objectives in mind.

We are encouraged by the upward trend.

Q17. Transfer [number of transfers]

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
17b. List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for the students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	1200	1200	1200
17c. List your stretch goal (aspirational) for the students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	1390	1404	1418
17d. List actual number or percentage of students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	1047	1006	

At the time of this meeting, data for the actual number of 2024-25 transfers was not yet available. However, it was reported during the meeting that the combined number of CSU and UC transfers for 2024-25 is slightly lower than 2023-24.

This completed the ACCJC annual report discussion. Additional sections to be populated include:

Q18. Licensure Examination Pass Rates

Q19. Employment Rates for Career and Technical Education Students

Meeting adjourned.

Future meetings for 2025-26:

April 20, 2026

June 1, 2026

Recording Secretary:

Jody Barrass, Administrative Secretary II, IRPE