INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 15, 2015, 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Boardroom

Present: Christina Howard, Ce Rosenow, Gary Mort, Phillip Martinez, Matt Danskine, Kate Sullivan, Craig Taylor, Molloy Wilson, Jennifer Steele, Lida Herburger, Dawn DeWolf, Brian Kelly **Absent**: Ashley Jackson, Bob Baldwin, Jennifer Frei, Rosa Lopez, Philos Molina **Notetaker:** Anna Kate Malliris **Guests:**

Item	Notes
Welcome & Updates	1. Critical Dates
	• Campus Core Theme Meetings- Nov. 5 th and 13 th & Dec. 4th
	Accreditation Work- Next report (Ad Hoc for all recommendations not covered in the last
	report) due 3/1/16
Review Institutional	Discussion to understand the model as described in <u>Year-One report</u> . For deeper understanding of the need
Effectiveness Model	for the model, see the NWCCU <u>evaluator's report</u> .
	• IEC is part of a larger system.
	• Reviewed Handout #1.
	• Raising the initiatives up to a level of looking at outcomes at the highest level to generate a mission
	fulfillment annual report.
	• The annual process will answer the questions: How are we doing? Where do we have gaps? And
	what are we doing to close the gaps? This would help with the planning process.
	• IEC told College Council about the work that IEC was doing and they indicated that the IEC should continue the work through the summer and bring it back at the next College Council meeting.
	• Summer work was about core themes and this handout is broader than just the core themes. Other
	than the governance councils, none of these groups currently report to College Council but this
	method will allow the work of the initiatives to be synthesized through the IEC and brought in front
	of the College Council. It does not change the work of College Council but rather provides some
	analysis and synthesis as it goes to College Council- it is about connectedness.
	• We have provided this as a model that will provide an institutional, systematic planning. NWCCU
	has not responded to this model and there may need to be adjustments to this model. If the graphic
	needs to be revised in order to better reflect the intention, Jen Steele will take feedback.
Review Core Themes	Briefly review and discuss where the <u>Core Themes, objectives, and indicators</u> ended up after accreditation
	work over the summer. Intent is to touch on potential issues, not solve them right now.

	1
	• Reviewed Handout #2- final version at the end of the summer work and submitted to NWCCU. The comments on the handout are from Mara Field to make clear why things were changed. They
	provide context about the changes that were made.
	• Rosenow, Field, Taylor, Herburger were part of the subcommittee developing the work. Lopez,
	Howard, DeWolf gave feedback. All feedback was responded to in person or by email.
	• More indicators were added over the summer, some rationale were changed, and rationales were added.
	• These can be updated as needed. Have not received feedback from NWCCU.
	• Recommendation that no more changes be made until the data is populated. That will show when the data does not match with the indicator language.
	• Recommendation that there needs to be additional work to identify the thresholds for the scoring (1, 2, 3) and those need to be considered when we see the data.
	• This is ongoing work will continue through the Year 3 report (when there should be some stability) and beyond.
	Committee Thoughts:
	• Core Themes and objectives seem good and not everyone has the skills necessary to assess whether the indicators and rationale are correct.
	• Molloy Wilson will provide data that he believes relate to the indicator and then a team will assess the data for which parts are best to use.
	• Start populating indicators with data so that the committee can start looking at where we are, how the data fits the indicator and reflects the work that we do, and how the data inform the thresholds. The outcome of data that fits well and is not good will not go away but will be reflected as a low score.
	• If for some of the indicators, there is not perfect data readily available, the institution will focus on trying to find something that will approximately measure the indicator rather than getting rid of the indicator.
	The committee may lack the capacity to fully evaluate the data.
Transition Indicators	Discuss what indicators we will use for accreditation reports during this transition year, as CTs and their
	related indicators are not final.
	• Reviewed Handout #3- Steele created a crosswalk between the old and new core themes.
	• Taylor and Wilson will review this and this is what will be what Molloy will populate with data.
	• The committee will need to approve the use of these transitional core theme indicators for this year.
	• Research out of CCRC that noted in meta-analysis of data that when we accelerate developmental
	education, the students transition into credit classes but they do not persist.

Choose Team Leads	Leads will assist the subcommittee to move the campus Core Theme meeting work this fall/winter.
for each Core Theme	 Outcome of the meetings: Build an awareness to the broader campus community, build a shared
& recruit a Core	understanding of the core themes, get meaningful feedback about how the core themes (could) apply to
Theme subcommittee	peoples work, where there might be content experts on the indicators and data. The meetings could
	inform how we do strategic planning. The meeting might inform how the work moves forward.
	• It is important that people understand that these core themes will actually guide the work of the college
	and will inform planning and accreditation.
	• The relationship of the Mission to the Core Themes to Strategic Directions to CLOs need to be made
	clear and they need to be made relevant to the work that people do.
	• If start at the bottom up, the process becomes broad and overwhelmingly time consuming. If start at
	the top down, there is not enough engagement to make the best connections and get input. There needs
	to be clarity about what you are asking and how they can engage in a way that actually affects the work
	people do. Suggest that we talk about setting the framework so that the work can move forward. Need
	to refine the discussion to engage people in the work and how to compel participation in core themes
	that deeply affect the work that people do.
	• May want to put people in their peer groups instead of a campus-wide meeting. In a big group, outspoken people go to the forefront and other people do not get connected to the work. If the peer
	groups meet, they will be able to focus on where they find/ and do not find connection and meaning in
	the core themes. If they produce these, then the committee could look across the feedback to see
	common areas of (dis)connection. Can't break out into small groups within the campus-wide meeting
	because you can't get people into the room at the same time. I might show up to get the framing in a
	large group but the work will happen in small groups. Staff will work in small affinity groups but
	getting people interested enough to come together and have the conversation can be difficult.
	• Looking for leads to craft the message, formulate the structure, and plan the meetings.
Future Agenda Items	• Set goals and create work-plan for the IEC for 2015-16 academic year, based on the college's
	institutional effectiveness model,
	Revise CT objectives/indicators as needed,
	• Design reciprocal structure for getting reports from governance councils, A-team, etc. (as described in
	report),
	• Develop communication plan for IEC's annual assessment of mission fulfillment,
	• Determine how mission-fulfillment assessment report will be written.
Questions to Answer	Need to get clarity about membership of the committee.

Other Resources	 <u>Institutional Effectiveness Website</u>. Includes past agendas/minutes/charter/member list. NWCCU Evaluators <u>recommendations</u> in response to our Year Seven Self-Evaluation.
Next Meeting	November 9 th from 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Boardroom