Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
MINUTES
October 26, 2026 – CI 159 and Zoom (hybrid)

Committee Members:

Committee Co-Chairs:
Lan Hao ..... P
Dan Volonte ..... P

Management:
John Albert ..... P
Jack Beckham ..... P
Eric Calderon ..... P
Claudette Dain ..... A
Dana Hester ..... P
Lisa McPheron ..... A
Kim Orlijan ..... P
Richard Rams ..... A
Gerald Sequeira ..... P
Ty Thomas ..... P

Academic Senate Representative:
Sonia Kibbe ..... P

Faculty:
Catie Besancon ..... P
Anh Nguyen ..... P
Becky Rudd ..... P

Supervisor/Confidential:
Rosario Garcia ..... P

Classified:
Yueyi Huang ..... P
Trevor Tolliver ..... P

ASCC:
Stella Ho ..... P

1. **September 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes Review**
   The minutes were approved as presented.

2. **Accreditation Update**
   The individual standard teams are continuing with the task of writing their draft narratives. The drafts should be completed in December 2026.

   A few managers and faculty will be attending the ACCJC Partners in Excellence conference in November. Math faculty will present on AB1705 during the poster session.

3. **SLOA and Program Review Surveys: Spring 2027**
   Context as to what has prompted the idea of administering the surveys:

   SLOA is an accreditation requirement. During the college's 2021 accreditation evaluation, there was a finding that our SLOA process needed improvement – particularly in terms of broader participation. Since that time, modifications to the process have been made.

   - The purpose is to obtain feedback regarding the newly implemented student learning outcomes assessment (SLOA) and program review processes. Over the last three years, there have been changes to the templates and the Padlet (see IEC minutes dated September 23, 2024).
   - The initial discussion of the survey took place at the Program Review/SLOA Committee.
     - Traditionally, IEC works together with the Program Review/SLOA Committee on some matters related to program review and SLOA, which is why the surveys have been brought to this meeting for discussion and possible editing.

- Both surveys presented are in the DRAFT stage.
- The timeline is to design and promote the surveys during the current fall semester, and administer them during the spring 2027.
- The SLOA survey
  - Survey audience: Faculty participating in SLOA

    Question #1 – Compared to how SLOA was done in the past, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the current process? (Likert scale)

    Question #2 – What do you find most effective about the current SLOA process? (Select all that apply) (Includes an "Other" box for respondent comments)

    Question #3 – Do you have any recommendations, suggestions, success in using the current template, or other information you would like to share about the SLOA process?

  - An optional question requesting that respondents identify their status and division, is intended to elicit an idea as to the level of participation in the process.
    1. Faculty status: Part time or Full time
    2. division

  - Six themes describe what we hope to ascertain through the survey:
    1. Participation and Frequency of Use [Padlet]
    2. Clarity of the SLOA Process
    3. Padlet Accessibility and Ease of Use
    4. Dialogue and Application of Results
    5. Training, Guidance, and Support
    6. Overall Satisfaction and Recommendations

  - Suggested edits were made by the group. One suggestion included adding text boxes after each question which would give participants the option to add comments or elaborate on their responses.

  - Survey results will be brought back to IEC, including themes developed from added comments.

- The Program Review Process and Effectiveness survey
  - Survey audience: Faculty, staff, managers

  - This survey is more extensive (10 questions). The rationale for including each question was explained.

    1. How have you participated in Program Review? (Select all that apply.)
    2. The instructions on the Program Review templates are clear. (Likert scale)
    3. How would you prefer to access Program Review templates and materials? (Select all that apply.)
    4. The data and information needed to complete Program Review are accessible and understandable. (Likert scale)
    5. Program Review helps my program or department identify needs, establish goals, and make improvements. (Likert scale)

6. My Program Review recommendations have had [an] impact on institutional and resource allocation. (Likert scale)
7. Program Review encourages meaningful discussion and collaboration within my program or department. (Likert scale)
8. Which resources would be most helpful in supporting your participation in Program Review? (Select up to three.)
9. What works well in the current Program Review process? (Open comment)
10. What changes would make Program Review more useful, efficient, and/or meaningful to your program or department? (Open comment)

- The group openly discussed the questions and ways some might be re-phrased to encourage meaningful and actionable responses, removed, or combined to reduce possible redundancies. This included revising some response options and adding space for comments. Because the survey is a draft, and to maintain brevity in these minutes, most suggested edits have been excluded.
- The survey introduction will be worded so that respondents are prompted to answer the questions with both the annual update and comprehensive program review in mind.
- Respondent information is asked (e.g., primary area and role, and program or division).
    - Expand on the primary role by removing “administrator” and adding “supervisor/confidential” in its place. Add “professional expert” as an option.
- To alleviate confusion regarding the term “accessibility,” a suggestion was made to change the occurrences of the word to either “ease of access” or “access” as appropriate.
- There will be a 2027 Flex Day program review session. One objective of this session will be to instill in faculty the connection between the comprehensive program review and the annual update.
    - The three-year comprehensive program review can be thought of as the reporting-out of prior year goals, and the establishment of new three-year goals.
    - The recurrent annual update can be viewed as describing the progress made on the goals between comprehensive reviews.

Meeting adjourned.

Future meetings for 2026-27:

11/23/26	2/22/27
	3/22/27
	4/26/27
	5/24/27

NOTE: This meeting’s supporting documents, meeting recording, and chat transcript are available upon request. Please email irpe@citruscollege.edu.