

**BC Process for Falling Below Institution-Set Standards 5/4/2017**

1. The Department of Institutional Effectiveness will record and regularly update each ISS in the Renegade Scorecard. These metrics are updated as they become available in the Fall and Spring semester.
2. When the college has not met an ISS, the Department of Institutional Effectiveness will notify the president with a goal to complete the discussion and mitigation plan before the end of the semester..
3. Data Coaches will examine the data to consider contextual elements that may influence the ISS in question in order to prepare a report.
4. The report will be submitted to Educational Administrators Council (EAC) and the Student Services Administrative Leadership Team (SALT) who will consider and document potential resolutions.
5. The suggested resolutions will be submitted to Faculty Chairs and Directors (FCDC), College Council, and Academic Senate for discussion and suggestions for action.
6. The corrective measures will be presented to the president who will direct appropriate resources.
7. The gap will be indicated with the resolution and documented in the Renegade Scorecard with a timeline.

**Commented [MSOffice1]:** Do we want to define what it means to not meet an ISS within the statement? Does this mean that the college fell below an ISS within 1% or 5%? Should this consider whether it was a onetime occurrence or whether it is a pattern of falling below an ISS? Possibly there are state standards that I am not aware of here.

**Commented [MSOffice2]:** Who will be responsible for submitting this to the president?

**Commented [MSOffice3]:** I am not really following this step – may need some clarification.

Hi Janet,

I can't think of any meaningful changes to this proposed system. I know it is a little late, but I do have some ideas about the score card. Currently we are looking at point estimates (single number representations of a population based on a sample). It is generally better to consider confidence intervals (a range of values that the true population parameter likely lies in).

We could have a system like you proposed for when the point estimate drops below the standard, and a softer one for when the confidence interval overlaps the standard. For example let us say that the standard is 65% success rate. Since there are a lot of random variables that go into just who successfully becomes a student that year, I am treating the year's data of who passed as a sample of who the community is serving rather than a full population census. Suppose the point estimate for that year is 67%. We can build a 90% confidence interval. This process might state that with 90% certainty the population parameter lies in the range 64.5% to 69.5%. Since that overlaps the ISS, it might invoke a softer response.

We might also have a response system for when the confidence interval overlaps the high end goal. That might involve investigating the programs that seem to be contributing the most to it. Maybe we could look at scaling those programs up to help the point estimate reach above the high end goal.

Just some ideas I thought I would share. I am new to this sort of business, so I apologize if this is all irrelevant.

Best,  
Jon