June 11 IEC meeting to develop objectives and indicators for CTs

Present: Matt, Dawn, Ce, Jennifer F., Craig, Gary, Maurice, Kate, Christina, (Molloy at 11:30, Brian after lunch)

Dawn: Lida H. and Philos added to committee to cover student services arena. May or may not be able to be here today.

Agenda: take a core theme (or two) and actually identify objectives and indicators. Reminder of deadlines. Need a draft to Board for July 8th meeting, and NWCCU in August.

Dawn: The Core Themes comments from Board and College Council and Tues. Deans—
- responsive community engagement, should include the concept of things like SSS, KLCC, SAI, OSBCN
- wording of "lane community" seemed insular, rather than taking in the whole regional community.
- The CT of "Comprehensive" is still a topic of discussion—is it part/ should it be part of some of the other CTs or does it really need to stand alone?
- Accessible and Equitable Learning—Suggested to add "Opportunities" after Learning, b/c Equitable Learning by itself doesn't make sense. Also "Strives" isn't strong enough of a word.

Process for getting the objectives: Jennifer goes over the Glaser model of Collective Problem Solving so we can use that process for creating the objectives and indicators. Dawn asked if team wants to use it. Maurice—are we going to use it to come up with objectives? Dawn: yes.

Christina defines her understanding of objectives (goals you want to meet), indicators (the metrics used to see if you've met those goals). There seems to be a disparity between what the terms mean to Lane and NWCCU (if different), and how would we explain that to the rest of the community at Lane. Need a shared construct of what these mean.

Craig: Begins with the Mission. Then NWCUU says create some CTs that individually describe the mission and collectively describe the mission. Looks at the old CTs and says they are still pretty broad. Objectives narrow it a bit more. Then the indicators did set measure.

Christina: Those metrics (the indicators), are those thresholds? Are we going to include an analysis of the old CTs indicators to include today in the new objective work? If we are to craft indicators, I'm not certain I'm comfortable doing that for things across the college because I'm not that informed right now. Wisdom in looking at historical indicators to see if we want to keep them.

Dawn: We didn't want to constrain people's creation of the new objectives by being stuck with specific indicators. We can find the data to support new objectives, and Craig and Molloy can provide lots of data in different ways with new projects.

June 11 IEC meeting to develop objectives and indicators for CTs

Look at old CTs from the 7 year report. The indicators chosen by the team at that time, were what we thought would answer our objective and we had the data for it.

Maurice: There's a shift now, because we are looking at ALL the constituent groups, not just a focus on "Academic Transfer" etc.

Craig: The timing of the 7 year report indicators reflect the era of performance based funding from the state. Pressure from the state with a highly outcome oriented that influenced the development of the indicators/objectives.

Ce: we found we didn't really measure our

CT: Quality Educational Environment.

"How do we know do we have one?", "What outcomes do we want to see in a QEE?" (broke into two groups and spent a half an hour following the Glaser model-silent brainstorming, round robin input, discuss and advocate, prioritize, to come up with some draft objectives for this CT)

First Brainstorm group #1 (Gary, Jennifer, Matt, Craig) (scoring for priority: higher # = better)
1) **Infrastructure (scored 1 for group's priority)**
2) % faculty w/ AM or higher
3) **student jobs (.5) Goes with #5 "success after Lane)**
4) applicable curriculum
5) **success after transfer (scored 1.5 for group's priority)**
6) faculty focus on teaching
7) % student pass C or higher
8) **dynamic curriculum revision (scored 11 for group's priority)**
9) standards followed
10) current skills—students
11) learning centered
12) increased global thinking (scored 1 for group's priority)
13) non-traditional class times/ offerings
14) extracurricular / co-curricular
15) **increased skill + knowledge (scored 9 for group's priority)**
16) timely faculty feedback

Consolidation:
- Faculty (use PDF): 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15,16
- Students (CLO's, success after Lane) 7,14,10,3,15,5,9,11
- Curriculum (implement FPD): 8, 12,4,5,10,11,15
- Infrastructure (part of that is to provide FPD): 14,12,1,9,13,15

June 11 IEC meeting to develop objectives and indicators for CTs

Objectives are:
1) Dynamic curriculum revision
2) Increased student Skill and knowledge
3) Success after Lane
4) Infrastructure

First Brainstorm group #2 (Dawn, Christina, Kate, Ce, Maurice)
1) curriculum visible courses aligned with programs objectives clearly defined
2) *courses and co-curricular we designed for a broad range of learners and constituencies* [this probably goes under a different CT]
3) robust support for Faculty Prof. Devel
4) engagement through personal relevance
5) student learning involves active engagement w/ metrics
6) crafted with "students" in mind
7) opportunities for student evaluation of educational environment
8) skills and content developed
9) courses and programs reflect student interest, (community), need, national conversations and are current
10) transparency in ways of knowing, that reflect context (situational or discipline)
11) interactive spaces for students, faculty and staff
12) engage in core learning outcomes across disciplines
13) students are exposed to a broad range of contemporary and historically relevant curriculum
14) cultivates a high value for faculty expertise
15) opportunity for meta reflection
16) students are encouraged and required for deep learning (reading, writing, reflection)
17) Prepared for next steps
18) Robust student services reflected in objectives
19) All students have opportunities for intellectual mentoring

Consolidations & Objectives
▪ High Impact Practices (active learning, collaborative learning, attention to rigor, student support): 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 19, (doable and measureable 'cause we've done it before)
▪ Continuous Professional Development (all staff current and relevant): 3, 11, 14, 9 (doable and measureable)
▪ Intentional & coherent curriculum: 1, 17, 9, 12, 8, 13, 6, 10 (doable, but long-range view beyond a one year analysis).

The Objectives

Process and product is important in many of these. Each person is going to vote for three of the 7 objectives (3 highest, 1 lowest). **(blue = priority)**

1) **High Impact Practices (8)**
2) **Continuous Professional Development (9)**
3) **Intentional & coherent curriculum (17)**
4) Dynamic curriculum revision (1)
5) Increased student Skill and knowledge (5)
6) Success after Lane (0)
7) **Infrastructure (8)**

Now: work through one of the objectives and come up with indicators for it. Two teams taking two objectives and come up with indicators.

Indicators for the Objectives

#1 (Gary, Matt, Craig, Jennifer, Dawn)

I. Continuous Professional Development (blue = priority)
1) Funding
2) **Participation (4)**
3) Do we value it? (1)
4) **Evidence of implementation (11)**
5) Links to other Core Themes (0)
6) Transparency, culture of expectation of participation (2)
7) Visibility of opportunities (0)
8) **Program review leads to improvement (9)** Not just that we have it or do it. What's important is that the learnings are applied and lead to improvement.
9) Validation of OK status after review/ assessment (0)
10) Innovation based on need (2)
11) Dept/ Division specific development opportunities (1)

Maurice: Do we really want to see that it's "implemented" or that it is changing the student experience for the better? The student should be the focus, and maybe we should measure / assess that.
Christina: Maybe it means talking about expertise and then effectiveness.
Kate: We want something in these core themes that there is actual expertise that faculty have that needs to be there.
Gary: is narrative self-assessment made by the faculty enough for NWCCU?
Craig: Can we use subjective, descriptive assessment as an indicator?
Dawn: I don't think we can make this decision today.

June 11 IEC meeting to develop objectives and indicators for CTs

Ce: when we come back to it, could it be in Program Review, and see if faculty could discuss the difference PD makes for them

II. Infrastructure (blue = priority)
1) Times campus is open—universally available (0)
2) Services meet industry standards (4)
3) Facilities, sustainability, transportation plans, resource use (1)
4) **Seamless consistent IT support/ availability (9)**
5) # classes at nontraditional times & modalities (0)
6) **students use & value co-curricular opportunities which are connected to CLOs and student life (9)**
7) **value and & benefit of resource centers (5)**
8) depart/ operations program review
9) governance (2)

Support for learning and learning environments. #4 helps student achieve their goals; #6 use them and #7 value them.

#2 (Molloy, Christina, Brian, Kate, Ce)
III. Intentional & Coherent Curriculum (blue = priority)
1) **Curriculum is an articulated plan maps to foundational and/or discipline and/or tech skills, and connects to the unit's philosophy and goals (horizontal).**
   a. Curric. is mapped to CLO's
   b. Curric. is systematically reviewed and revised to reflect current disciplinary standards

Rationale: Intentionality is shown through an articulated plan. And coherent is addressed by CLO and review and revised.

2) **Curric. articulates (transfer & CTE)** thinking about how the program articulates with degrees and external exams (vertically). Also thinking about students getting internships or coop experiences (diagonally)
3) Programs and pathways are visible, published, and accessible
4) Faculty assume primary responsibility for implementation and development of the curric w/ input from all communities of interest

IV. High Impact Practices
1) **Students report high levels of awareness and satisfaction w/ HIPs on campus (e.g. academic advising)**
2) Students understand how to choose a path, navigate the curric. and meet their educational goals
3) **Using Lane's systems, students create clear roadmaps to learning & success**
4) Courses are mapped to the CLOs
5) Students report high levels of engagement w/ their learning experiences

Wrap-up

June 11 IEC meeting to develop objectives and indicators for CTs

Dawn: Did you like the process of doing the Glaser method?
Christina: liked it overall. Need to preserve the numbered lists so everyone can see the thinking. Four hours was what was needed
Kate: it was a lot less painful than I thought it would be! It was good.
Gary: thought it was good.
Matt: Good. Lot of stuff I don't understand coming not from the academic side.
Craig: worked for me
Jennifer: lots of discussion, lots of different things, and we put up our numbers. Seemed like people were OK with what floated to the top. Didn't get a sense of people's ideas being left out. Felt collaborative.
Ce: was concerned when we started, but actually it worked.
Maurice: system is great. We were a little loose at first with the system, but tightened up
Brian: The idea of chunking it out into doable pieces has been really helpful for the group. Not working for a perfect product helps creativity.
Molloy: I do still have an issue with the voting system where you have a 3 or 2 or 1, versus how many people put their dots on that one.