I. The meeting was called to order at 11:00

II. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. The minutes of the September meeting were presented. No changes were recommended. Marcia Roberts-Deutsch made a motion to approve the minutes, Kyle Higa seconded, and the motion was passed unanimously.

III. Reports and Responses
   1) Accreditation Task Force
      a) The Accreditation Task Force met for the first time on September 19, 2014.
         i. Fall 2014 activities include:
            a. Orientation for Task Force members (members were asked to review the CCIE and Task Forces Charters and the Comprehensive Assessment Planning Calendar, posted on the intranet.)
            b. Review of the Follow-Up Report due to ACCJC in mid October (members were provided with a near-final draft of that report.)
            c. Review of the Actionable Improvement Plan (AIP) updated in September 2014 (this will be the focus of the November meeting.)
            d. Planning for the research and writing of the Midterm Report (due in October, 2015, but evidence-gathering must be done in Spring 2015, and writing in Spring 2015 should result in a draft that can be shared with the campus for review.)
         ii. Spring 2015 activities will include:
            a. Focus on completion of tasks from the AIP (responsible persons or groups are identified in AIP; will create a timeline and ask those responsible to help set deadlines.)
            b. Review Follow-Up Reports from Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 to determine what can be incorporated into Midterm Report, which must address all the original recommendations as well as the AIP.
            c. Develop working groups for each recommendation to gather additional evidence and develop a working draft.
            d. The Accreditation Task Force may need some assistance in the last task named above. It may make most sense to ask some of those who were on the initial self-study committees (2010-2012) to contribute to this work.
            e. One additional determination made by the Accreditation Task Force was to include representation from IT on a consulting basis, rather than as a regular member of the committee.
2) Assessment Task Force  
   a) The task force is currently working on  
      i) Creating a database to run with Sharepoint that will provide the ability to deal with numeric assessment  
      ii) Setting up a subcommittee to create three standard models of assessment to use as a basic rollout of an online assessment system in order to prepare the campus and beta test the system.  
      iii) Deciding on a set of terms to use for tagging data and documents within Sharepoint  
   b) In Spring the task force plans to  
      i) Provide more assessment workshops  
         (1) Use of the numeric database system  
         (2) Use of terms for data tagging  
      ii) Roll out the sharepoint system with database for beginning use by a few volunteer programs/disciplines.  
      iii) Read and provide feedback on 5-year ARPDs  
   c) Primarily we will require people to work on these projects. As of now, it is not clear that we will need any new equipment, software, etc... We may ask Faculty Development, or the College, for some funding for refreshments for workshops.

3) Additional Member Reports  
   a) Steven noted that the ARPD will be delayed until the end of this month, and that will mean that consolidation of data for the 5-Year reports will also be delayed, probably until February.  
   b) Last year was the first year that data across a 5-year span was consistent enough to do 5-year reports.  
   c) The ARPD is only the data that comes from the CC System. They want to be sure that we are aware that the Program Reviews and annual reviews, in which explanatory information is added to the data, is the purview of the campus.  
   d) Kyle asked whether the Academic Support division will be responsible in its program reviews and annual reports for dealing with the differences in data between its disparate functions. The committee clarified that since the CC System does not provide data for non-instructional programs, data is measured in different ways by the campus depending upon the functions of each program. The Academic Support division will thus have to include in its reports the disparate data and analysis for each of its units.

IV. New Business  
   a. Marcia asked if the committee could have a conversation around how we define “Institutional Effectiveness.” At HCC, some Institutional Effectiveness programs fall under the purview of other bodies, including the Planning Council, the Assessment Task Force, etc.  
      i. The Committee agreed this was an important job to undertake. It seems important for the CCIE to be sure that its activities do not overlap the activities of other campus committees in charge of Institutional Effectiveness functions. Adding functions that are currently not under the purview of other organizations might also include the need to change the CCIE charter. This is not something to do lightly.
ii. The CCIE is authorized in its charter to manage the Planning Calendar. Doing this will involve making sure that various units at the College are working on the appropriate activities on the appropriate timeline. Thus the CCIE does have some authority in all Institutional Effectiveness Functions.
   1. Marcia will send a link to this calendar to all committee members.

iii. The draft “Institutional Effectiveness Handbook,” created by the former Assessment Committee, can also be used as an indicator of what HCC, and comparable institutions nationally, consider to be Institutional Effectiveness.
   1. Pat will send a link to the handbook to all committee members.

iv. The committee agreed that members would read, take notes, and add discussions of these functions to future CCIE agendas.

v. The committee also expressed a desire to “meet people where they are” by collecting information on what different groups are already doing in terms of Institutional Effectiveness, thus avoiding the impulse to reinvent IE on the campus, but rather to work with what is already in existence.

vi. The committee agreed that the Institutional Effectiveness calendar is a fluid document that provides flexibility. It is regularly updated, with past years dropping off as new years are added to the front. However, making the document flexible also depends on making certain that we get regular input from constituents. So information flow is critical.

b. Sterling asked the committee to consider how it wants to receive midterm reports from the Accreditation and Assessment Task Forces, and what the midterm reports should include. The committee agreed to the following:
   i. The deadline for the midterm report to be given to the CCIE will be Jan. 9
   ii. The content will include:
      1. A summary of minutes of task force meetings.
      2. A summary of ongoing projects
      3. A summary of future projects
      4. A discussion of what needs the committee has and how those might be met.
         a. This should also include a discussion of problems or issues the task force is facing.
      5. Information on the Task Force Chair, and membership
      6. Identification of subgroups (ad hoc working groups) to include
         a. Chair and membership
         b. A summary of minutes of working group meetings.
         c. A summary of ongoing working group projects
         d. A summary of future working group projects

   iii. The Committee agreed that midterm reports would be posted publicly online, that they would be used to direct the Task Force efforts, and that College governing bodies would be notified of their reception by the CCIE
   iv. The committee agreed that year-end reports would have the same format. Use, and deadlines, will be decided by the CCIE later.

V. Adjourn 12:16 PM