

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 17, 2015, 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Boardroom

Present: Ce Rosenow, Matt Danskine, Dawn DeWolf, Lida Herberger, Christina Howard, Brian Kelly, Rosa Lopez, Phil Martinez, Jennifer Steele, Kate Sullivan, Craig Taylor, Molloy Wilson

Absent: Bob Baldwin, Jennifer Frei, Ashley Jackson, Philos Molina

Notetaker: Deborah Butler

Guests:

Item	Notes
Additions to Agenda	Review membership, including the text noted in 11/19/15 minutes as “not discussed”
Vote to Approve Minutes from 11/19/15 Meeting	<p>Approved unanimously with changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct date to read Nov. 19
Discussion Items	<p>1. Review Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson: Want to discuss “2/3” language in minutes from last meeting; it should be clarified as 2/3 of those present, not 2/3 of the total committee. • Sullivan: Faculty will be disadvantaged in voting process because they will not be able to attend all meetings, unless digital voting is made available in every case. • Steele: Conversation and discussion at meetings inform the decision-making process, so digital voting is not ideal. • Howard: Any voting items should be named ahead of time in the agenda, so that members are informed and can make arrangements for vote and possibly proxy statements if they are unable to attend. Voting should be the first agenda item of the meeting, so that everyone is clear about when it will occur. • Martinez: Doesn’t specifically recall the discussion about this item when it was created, but willing to trust Wilson’s understanding about the voting process because it is logical. 2/3 of those present at a meeting would likely be about 1/2 of the total committee and enough for quorum. Total committee size is 15, and 12 or 13 members is pretty good in terms of attendance. If quorum is present and item is passed with 2/3 of votes from those present, electronic vote would not be large percentage of total committee. • Howard: Someone needs to take leadership role in fleshing out these rules so that they are clear and written in full sentences. (Wilson volunteered to draft these and send via email for committee

review).

- Kelly: Would like clarification about how unassigned/missing group representatives should be counted; are they part of the total committee membership number? Groups with representatives marked as “missing” at last meeting have been contacted via email (no responses at time of this meeting).
- Sullivan: Since several representatives are missing from this committee and we are discussing voting process, we should also discuss whether every group needs to be represented in order to bring an item to vote.
- Lopez: Concerned about how “group” is defined; council reps, faculty reps, classified...one representative doesn’t necessarily carry all concerns from a single group, and individuals often represent several interests.
- Martinez: Agrees with Lopez, but non-participation should not slow down progress on an issue; we can’t have a systematic way for votes to be held up by non-participants.
- Kelly: This discussion will be the first item on agenda for Jan 21 meeting. Note that groups not represented in membership now include 1 each of student, faculty and staff, plus one from college council, so there doesn’t appear to be a problem with unequal representation at this time.

2. Work Teams for Core Themes

- Kelly: We need to identify the scope of work and process for periodic check-ups and refining on core themes indicators.
- Wilson: What will these teams do? Judging? Creating measurements?
- Taylor: Team will do more than just check off a box next to data; they will need to review data and make sure it makes sense.
- Steele: whoever measures the indicators will also be in the best position to participate in Strategic Directions mapping, which we’ll also discuss as a potential project for this group.
- Wilson: We need to discuss “Scope of Work” item on agenda before we can discuss this item further. **Move to amend agenda to discuss “Scope of Work” item 4 at this time. Motion approved.**

3. Scope of work/work plan for next 6 months

- Kelly: Strategic Directions must be completed by June 2016 at direction of Board. If this committee does Strategic Directions mapping, it will need to be done in time to use in development of Strategic Directions.
- Howard: We need clarification on whether the idea behind work teams would be to assign a single theme and ask the team to do all of the work involved with that theme, or some other assignment.

Institutional knowledge and information about indicators and measurements is not something available to every member. Why aren't we staying with the whole-group discussion process used for Core Themes over the summer?

- Kelly: Idea is that a small group would be responsible for updating and refining the indicators for a specific Core Theme in accordance with group decisions.
- Taylor: Summer Core Themes process was different, because it was a small number of people doing regular work on the project. Taylor, Rosenow, Steele, Mara Fields and Maurice Hamlin worked together before sending information to group for review and comments. It was a lot of work for a small group to complete prior to group discussion.
- Steele: At forums, that there was a lot of feedback and questions about the indicators, which implies that there are many people with different skill sets who would be able to engage in this analysis. No need to be an expert in indicators to determine whether they're in line with the Core Theme.
- Lopez: Having an IRAP person in these small groups would be important, for consistency and depth of knowledge about indicators and availability of data.
- Martinez: Not concerned about lack of experience with data, because anyone with access to existing information on Classbuilder, Argos, and elsewhere can look at indicators and measurements currently used. Indicators should not be viewed as just number data, because the numbers aren't meaningful without a connection to the experience of different people within the community
- Kelly: There were many voices involved in Core Themes forums from people without data analysis expertise, and they had many insightful comments and questions.
- Wilson: **Move to amend agenda to return to "Scope of Work" item 4 discussion at this time** instead of continuing this conversation about work teams.
- Rosenow: **Propose agenda addition to next agenda to discuss evaluating and assessing IEC effectiveness for the year.** Maybe at retreat in July?

4. Strategic Directions mapping

- Steele: Plan would be to map Core Themes to existing Strategic Directions to determine how they align, and then identify gaps. That information would be used to develop new Strategic Directions.
- Lopez: College Council is responsible for Strategic Directions.
- Kelly: Mapping activity would be part of the process, and would be joint project between IEC and College Council.
- Wilson: Questions the usefulness of mapping, but would like to know how College Council feels about that information; do they need it/want it? It sounds like a lot of work and it may not be

useful.

- Taylor: Clarified that existing strategic directions predate Core Themes and have never been linked to Core Themes. If that is the plan for the future, we'll need to do some analysis.
- Steele: This isn't a scientific mapping process, and it would be collaborative with College Council; work would need to be performed early in winter term to make sure College Council has the information in time to complete Strategic Directions work for the Board.
- Kelly: **Move to add Strategic Plan mapping to IEC work plan.**
- Wilson: Need clarification prior to vote about how many IEC members and College Council members would be participating.
- Kelly: Plan would be to create teams including some IEC members and some College Council members to perform work together, then present to IEC, which would share with College Council.
- Sullivan: Would like to discuss possibility of using a Google drive to share documents with this group because email is hard to track.
- Martinez: Struggling to understand the connection between the Core Themes and Strategic Directions. What does it tell us? What is the end goal?
- Lopez: We have our Mission, and Core Themes are how we meet the Mission. Strategic Directions are where we are headed in the future. As we assess our Mission and Core Themes, Strategic Directions are likely to change.
- Rosenow: Strategic Directions predate the Core Themes, and are not completely aligned. There may be Strategic Directions that remain over time because they have value to this college and community.
- Steele: Strategic Directions are what we need to focus on over next 5 years; they bring in external forces, but also identify our biggest gaps. It's where we focus our energy, not everything we do.
- Kelly: To clarify, this group wants a report back from a sub-group made up of both IEC and College Council (**group affirms**). **Call for volunteers: Rosenow, Sullivan, Howard, DeWolf, Steele, Taylor (DeWolf, Steele and Taylor are also members of College Council) volunteer.**

5. Visiting other councils

- Taylor: This is a learning activity, to help governing groups make connections between their work and the Core Themes.
- Wilson: Should be more of a presentation of information, not a conversation where one or two people from council answer questions from several groups.
- Howard: Objective of forums was to present Core Themes, not to gather information. Maybe it would be a better idea to use visits to get feedback from governing groups; data collection rather than just explanation of Core Themes.

- Sullivan: The need is to connect people and their work to the Core Themes. Data collection wouldn't be useful until we identify what we want to measure.
- Rosenow: Would like to have a list of the groups being discussed. Some of these groups submit reports to this committee once yearly (Accreditation, SEM, etc.), and all of those should be included.
- Kelly: All councils will be on the list, and who else?
- Group Response: Program Review, Faculty Council, ASLCC, Continuing Ed/SBDC/Florence and Cottage Grove centers, Peer2Peer.
- Martinez: We're looking at people who can contribute to this conversation, right? We should be including not just councils and committees, but divisions (Arts and Sciences, Student Affairs, etc.)
- Wilson: This is a very big list, and there is a lot of overlap in membership. It sounds like there may be more groups than necessary on this list. Concerned that it doesn't make sense to solicit feedback from every group on campus. Visits should be explanatory rather than collecting data.
- Kelly: We have three different proposals for the content of these visits. Can we agree on a focus?
- Howard: We're not necessarily looking for feedback from everyone, but we need to capture data from these meetings to make sure we understand how well campus community gets it—need to measure that before we talk about refining or changing. We have no data about whether people understand the themes. We've had big meetings but haven't collected anything, or we've collected information and haven't done anything with it.
- Lopez: Agrees that there is a lot of overlap in group membership on this list, since very active campus community members tend to be tapped for lots of projects and committees and others don't participate at all. It also excludes people who aren't on committees (part time classified, for example).
- Kelly: Would the group like to make these visits part of the IEC work plan for the next 6 months?
- Wilson: Would support the idea, if there were clear goals and objectives defined at January meeting
- **Taylor and DeWolf : Volunteer to take a closer look at objectives and clarify for the group.**
- **Wilson: Volunteered to work on assessment discussion and data collection once objectives are clarified, provided there were other volunteers as well.**
- Sullivan: We have big meetings where we collect a lot of data, but nothing happens with the data.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:35pm

Next Meeting

January 21 from 3:00-4:30 p.m. in the Boardroom

