

IEC Meeting 6-24-15

Attending: Gary, Lida, Matt, Rosa, Ce, Jen, Molloy, Kate, Maurice, Craig, Dawn

Dawn: We didn't finish #4 and we need to do that. There was conversation that there could be indicators under OTHER themes, or we need to complete the objectives and indicators for this one. We'll spend about 45 min. and then move on to:

- 1) Each CT, and its O & I, and see if the indicators will:
  - ◆ they have sig impact on the problem,
  - ◆ be doable
  - ◆ be observable and measurable
- 2) prioritize goal is 2 to 3 indicators for each objective
- 3) AND set up a subcommittee to finish these for the 1 year report.

We got down to the indicators for CT 4 (Comprehensive Educational Opportunities) and found that they seemed to fit into other themes.

Maurice: Saying we're comprehensive is a different level of commitment. Given our resources, I'm not even sure we want to make that kind of commitment. We have to prioritize what we provide the community. Can't be everything for all people. Hinges on how we use the word Comprehensive.

Kate: I would say being comprehensive would be that we have the resources they need when they come in. Reading center, Writing Center, Etc. to help them. I think the health center is addressing this too, in a way.

Rosa: I would put that in accessibility.

Dawn: Can we actually say that we provide a comprehensive suite of services to support students?

Kate: We would have to have systems in place to give realistic assessment.

Rosa: it might be that we just have places for those students to start, like GED or ESL.

Jen: To me that's an indicator of responsive community engagement. We might be able to get to the interests of the comprehensive elements, through the other core themes.

Rosa: We could put CTE/Workforce needs and Transfer under community responsiveness, and Foundational under Accessibility.

Lida: Where does student services/ affairs fit?

Rosa: It could probably go under three of the other themes.

Dawn: We would need explicit language to call out the student services piece if we move it to other themes.

Kate: Do other colleges have this language?

Dawn/Ce/ Craig. Not really seeing this in other reports/ colleges.

Take a pulse—how many people might agree to Rosa’s suggestion about rolling it under the other Core Themes?

Jen: I support b/c I think it will make the other CTs more robust. Craig, Gary, Lida supports.

Molloy: All the indicators seem to go somewhere else. But this theme is about “comprehensive” and where would that idea go? It’s in our mission.

Dawn: It would have to be an objective and indicators in other themes.

Kate: If we take it out, does it limit the breadth of programs and offerings so we end up like other colleges that have two humanities courses.

Rosa: Maybe the idea of comprehensive could go under #2 “Quality”

What do we do about the other IEC members who aren’t here?

Dawn: We could break into teams/ all discuss and try to roll Comprehensive into all them with objective and/or indicator. The group affirms it for the report, and then bring it back to the full IEC in the fall. We won’t take a full vote b/c we don’t have a quorum, and then we move the work forward for the report.

Jen: A request. If we can try to avoid adding additional objectives to keep it manageable.

South Central had 54 indicators or some such.

### Ways to put Comprehensive into the others this way:

Objective 4.5 – under CT #2 (2.4 is some overlap)

Objective 4.4 – under CT #1

Objective 4.3 – under CT 5

Obj 4.2 – could go under #3 (3.1) and #1 (maybe a new objective or an expansion of the description)

The concept of “comprehensive” can go under #2, 2.3’s indicators.

Rosa: Let’s be mindful that the term comprehensive still encompasses the long-standing meaning of the four bullet-points.

Lida: Where is enrollment services, vets program, Center for Access Resources, etc. here?

Dawn: We worked on “accessibility” and didn’t break it out in that detail.

Now go back and check each CT (not word-smithing), break into groups and walk through the objective and the indicator and be sure the indicators are going to give us the information we need

- ◆ Do they align with the objective / have significant impact on the prob.
- ◆ are doable
- ◆ are observable and measurable
- ◆ then prioritize to have 2-3 indicators for each objective

Molloy: Do we have to limit the objectives too?

Dawn: We really don’t want more than 3 objectives either. Think about the most impact on the theme.

Molloy: many of our indicators equate to a full dissertation, rather than aligning with one data point.

Dawn: Just have our eyes on it, ask those kinds of questions for the next step and record them

Kate: I have issue with #2s wording. A quality Ed. environ. Cannot “embrace”

- 1) Responsive Community Engagement—Molloy, Lida
- 2) Quality—Jen, Maurice, Gary
- 3) Transform – Ce and Kate, Dawn
- 4) Access—Rosa & Craig & Matt

### **#1 Responsive Comm. Engage.**

(get notes from Molloy). How might be measure? Catalog & categorize all partnerships, surveys to the partners. “Employer satisfaction” hits on the CTE programs that already do surveys, but each indicator doesn’t have to measure the whole objective.

1.2 (a) does tell us how involved in the community we are. List is gonna be really long. Doesn't tell me anything about the purpose/quality of the involvement.

Kate: Public Commons equates to being a place that contributes to the public good (red cross staging area, KLCC, dental clinic, etc. we're more than a college.)

Jen: enviro. Stewardship

Craig: We are more than a collection of CTE and transfer programs.

Dawn: this can address the students' focus on social justice if we can make this aligned with public good.

1.2(b): what does it mean to just have a simple count? Increases will show improvement, % of students/ participants will show how what percentage of the folks are involved. Does this overlap with Accessibility's indicator? How do we contain it and make it a meaningful measure?

Objective 1.3 to capture the "Comprehensive" in the old four themes. Indicators could be something like "the number of transfer and degree programs that complete program review". We could look at the old core themes to come up with indicators here. It is a lot of counting. Foundational skills: % enrolling, completing

## #2 Quality Ed. Environment

2.1 High Impact Practices—needs to have some wording about currency and relevancy.

2.1a: good as is.

2.1(b): it's not just about systems, its about people. We could look at academic planning & advising touch-points. Capture the idea that they are making a plan, and then engaging with it via advising.

2.2: Continuous Professional development **and improvement**

we can track: participation rates, financial/time investment. *Evidence of implementation* was a sticky one. We can track that we DID implement it, but a qualitative measure is hard.

Is there a way faculty gets PD funds, there could be a follow up survey 6-9 months later to see how it has informed their teaching? There's a time element too, b/c a year later something clicks or an opening happens. But it's worth trying to measure. We want students to be meta-cognitive, but we don't require faculty to do this. They aren't expected to ruminate or cognate on it. Craig: I like this as a change prompting-process.

Process: There could be an online form on FPD's site, and have faculty do scale and narrative sections.

2.3 (a): Mapping to CLOs is measurable and relevant. But we didn't understand the language above it.

2.3(b): this could be measureable if we established some criteria. This would be a major shift. We might have to have some policies around scaffolding of classes, what % of classes articulate to OUS schools, etc. The fear from faculty might be that courses that aren't high enrolled if you scaffold. This is going to be quite challenging. Do we want to take it on right now. What are the incremental steps to get there? The assessment teams work may lead to some of these outcomes, but it would be really ambitious to think that (b) would not be incremental.

We want to make this do-able. Its not so much the number of articulation agreements, but that they are well aligned and structured. "We monitor and revise?"

We don't know what the OARs are going to be around it. So for now, we recognize this is IMPORTANT, work on it next year. What is doable is the two bullet-points on CLOs and systematic-review of curric.

2.4 Infrastructure covers a lot more than IT/ resource centers/ co-curricular. We don't want a laundry list, but there should be more. Also, that we sustain it. Library and some other things are covered in other standards.

(a) We can measure. (b) We can track participation of through CCSSE. (c) Support centers: Counts and surveys through multi-cultural centers, resource centers; we gather that data already.

### **#3 Transformative Student Achievement**

We changed lang. in the description. 3.1 we kept the same and (a) & (b) e.g. persistence to second year

3.2. We threw out (a). We radically revised (c): "Students engage in diverse learning opportunities and benefit from it" Could do student focus groups or look at engage CLOs, (e.g., multicultural center). Have the opportunity to engage in global learning. (Ce took notes on this one for more detail)

Got rid of (d) b/c its in two other places. And (e) b/c its in other places too.

### **#4 Accessible and Equitable Learning Opps.**

Lane strives to minimize barriers and maximize opportunities for learning.