Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Thursday, May 7, 2015, 9-11 a.m.
Building 4, Room 104

Present: Phil Martinez, Rosa Lopez, Gary Mort, Jennifer Frei, Craig Taylor, Matt Danskine, Molloy Wilson, Ce Rosenow, Mara Fields, Dawn DeWolf,

Recorder: Liz Pratt

AGENDA
1. Decisions
2. Joint meeting with the Accreditation Team May 21, 3-5 p.m.
3. Timelines for approval by the Board and submission to NWCUU
4. Review of input
5. Additional members to the committee
6. Other items

MINUTES
1. Decision-making Process for the I.E.C.
The Glaser Model: Identify topic or question. Each person takes time to develop short statement, a reason, an example to support, and a summary. At the meeting, each person takes their turn to make their point. Others listen without interruption. In the second round, each person asks one question either to specific person or the entire group, and that person responds. This may lead to discussion. Throughout the process, each person makes notes on items multiple people agree on. Then the group creates list of points of agreement. Next, the group works through this list creating two sublists: agreement and sticking points. The list of agreements is set aside and the group focuses on the sticking point discussing why or why not and what is the concern. At some point, when 80% of the conversation is in agreement, the group moves on to the next item.

Discussion of decision-making
- If using thumbs up/down, include thumbs side-ways (I can live with it). Set threshold of how many people need to be present to vote.
- Challenge with Glaser Model is time constraints on individual members. To reach effective decisions, we need to take the time to consider the decision points outside of the meetings.
- Consensus: goal is thought, consideration, inclusion, listening, discourse. With majority vote, all minority is swept off table. Do we want structure or trust ourselves or facilitator.
- We can find places where we agree and talk about the sticking points and then move to thumbs up/down.
- The first attempt is to listen. If we come to agreement, we set aside that point. Then agree to discuss a sticking point. Then we decide to set a time for discussion. 80/20 of discussion: how productive is the discussion. Are we getting anywhere?
- Include room for minority report as needed—documenting and maintaining documents.

Discussion of quorum and voting:
- When we need a vote, shall we use majority or super-majority. Determine upfront or at time of vote? Take advantage of digital forums for discussion and voting. Document decisions to be made and email to group. Provide timeline and hold to deadline.

- Typically quorum 2/3 or 80% of membership: with 17 members on committee, a quorum should be 11 (65%) and minimum would be 9 (53%) to pass a vote. If quorum is not present, then the decision goes to electronic voting. Threshold is 50% plus 1.
- If you don't weigh in, then your vote will be counted as an "I can live with it"
- Proposal: A quorum is two-thirds (2/3) of official committee membership (identified and named representatives), not including open seats.
- Proposal: 80% of the quorum or larger is required for voting.
- If we do have a quorum and send it to the digital forum, someone could share input at next meeting without revisiting the vote.
- Proposal: If we do not have a quorum, then the decision is sent to a digital forum (electronic vote).
- Proposal: Any time we take a vote, we will inform the entire committee.
- If there is a quorum, there will not be a second round of digital voting, but those who were not in attendance can have a few minutes to talk about it so that it is recorded in the minority report.
- Proxy voting is only appropriate when a proposal is on the table. The digital vote would eliminate proxy. For a very clearly defined written proposal that is sent out ahead of time, those who could not attend could still register their digital vote.

The I.E.C. Modified Consensus Model

Agreements	Sticking Points
First attempt consensus	
Try to hear everyone out	
Minority report	
80/20 discussion process	
Use for both decisions and taking temperature: • thumbs up = I support this, • thumbs down = I can't support this, • thumbs side-ways = I can live with this	
Discuss and agree on the amount of time needed for sticking points	
A quorum is two-thirds (2/3) of official committee membership (identified and named representatives), not including open seats.	
If we do not have a quorum, then the decision is sent to a digital vote, to be done within 2 days (*MF edits*).	
80% of quorum vote yes required to pass vote (*MF edit*)	
Decisions made by a quorum are final.	
No proxy votes	
Use modified Glaser Model	

2. Joint meeting with the Accreditation Team
- May 19 at 1-3 p.m. in the Boardroom (Bldg 3, Rm 216)
- Attending: Jen Steele, Ce Rosenow, Maurice Hamington, Kerry Levett, MJ Kuhar, Dawn DeWolf.

- Objective is to bring together what accreditation wants and our core themes as drafted.

3. Timelines for approval by the Board and submission to NWCUU

Document: Core Themes Planning

- Based on accreditation report. Timeline created by working backwards. All in electronic format by May 14. Once report is in and establish core themes, we have some time to make an assessment between year 1 and year 3.
- Who is monitoring the online input: Jen Steele and Ce Rosenow. Matt Danskine approves items for the blog. Several responses are about wordsmithing. One item is sustainability: people may feel that we've lost sustainability if it doesn't show up. Jennifer Hayward submitted a response regarding sustainability and sent her response to others who might be interested.

Discussion of core themes and relation to mission statement, CLOs, and objectives

- Maurice explained the relationship: the mission statement is first with the core themes below and then the objectives and measurements below, and yet everything feeds upwards into the mission statement.
- If something is thrown into the values but not included anywhere else, is it really a part of the whole?
- With a high-level institutional concept, we will describe a core theme specifically, limited to two or three ideas. Keep it simple so that we can monitor how we are fulfilling our mission statement. Advised to keep core themes to three to four: manifest an institutions mission and collectively inform the mission.
- Does a class accomplish all of the CLOs or can the program accomplish all CLOs with individual classes
- Rosa and Ce volunteered to be a part of a group to inform the relationships between the mission, core themes, and objectives. This may be an agenda item at another meeting.
- Strategic planning process will kick off in Fall and lead by College Council.

4. Review of input

Document: Core Themes Feedback from Spring Conference 2015

- Due May 14, one week from today
- Schedule another meeting or create a subcommittee
- Before next meeting, synthesize and group responses. Ce, Mara, Molloy, and Craig volunteered. Ce and Jen already have a meeting scheduled. Grouping means putting like items together. Gary suggested adding an "I have no idea" group. No student input so far. Ashley Jackson made the request.
- DECISION: Dawn will talk to Ashley regarding gathering student input on the core themes.
- DECISION: Create subcommittee to group and distil the responses (Ce, Mara, Molloy, Matt, and Craig)
- DECISION: Send out email to committee members not in attendance to inform and invite those who are interested to join this subcommittee.
- Do we need a place where all links and documents can be stored, such as a Wiki or Google Drive so that we can collect information and/or responses.
- Mara has stepped in to perform project management. Anna Kate will be on FMLA Leave periodically.
- Email subject lines

5. Additional members to the committee
- Student affairs would like to be represented.

6. Other items
- On blog or other forum, should we be posting to that or should we be only collecting items? Is it appropriate when we are a member of this committee to respond/vote as a member of the campus community?
DECISION: Discuss at next meeting