

IEC Meeting Notes

September 17, 2020, Time 10:00 am - 12:00 pm, via Zoom

Members present: Molloy Wilson, Christine Andrews, Paul Jarrell, Kate Sullivan, Marsha Sills, Tammie Stark, Shannon Ball, Chris Rehn, Ian Coronado, Carla Arciniega, Richard Plott, Brandon Gibson, Cathy Thomas (guest), Anna Scott (guest)

Announcements:

- [PRFR submitted](#)
- The NWCCU site visit is Fall 2021

During this meeting we heard an update from the Institutional Indicator Subcommittee and the IEC Communications Team. We discussed Mission Fulfillment Indicators (MFI) communication materials including a website chart and indicator scorecard mockups, an early draft of the survey gather data to improve the program review process, the rating system used to determine mission fulfillment and a new draft charter for the IEC.

Updates:

- (Mission Fulfillment) Institutional Indicator Subcommittee

The subcommittee work is progressing well. There are 2 more meetings in October during which we will finalize the information before it is brought to the IEC in November.

- IEC Comms Team: Mission Fulfillment Indicators, (MFI) Update
 - [MFI Website Sample v2](#) (Cathy)
 - [MFI Scorecard Sample v3](#) (Cathy)

Cathy Thomas provided a sample chart and scorecard with a request for feedback for improvements. The website chart will be a main landing page for the MFIs. Each MFI will include a link that takes the reader to a scorecard. Each MFI will have its own scorecard.

The early drafts, linked above, are not ready for detailed work such as final wordsmithing or actual data, but rather feedback on the look, feel and aesthetics. The trend information on the chart will likely include up to 5 years of data. The target is roughly equal to the benchmarks and a baseline we strive to achieve. Recommendations included verifying the accessibility of the triangle icons. It was noted that the trend does not equal the rating. An upward, downward or flat trend line, for example, could show Improvement, but we still made not meet our mission in that area. The addition of notes and or a legend will describe symbols, rating, etc. On the website this may be a popout window/box. It was suggested that this type of information invites comparisons with other schools, which will be part of the content of the scorecards.

The scorecard will be a deeper dive into the data. At the bottom of the scorecard there will be links to lessons learned and next steps that take the reader to a new document or page. Creation of the content for the scorecards will include engagement with stakeholders in that area of the college who can provide additional insight.

All of the members of the committee expressed appreciation for the work as well as affirmation that these communication materials should be used. It was also noted that these will help us provide data narratives that will help people understand the material. They will also evolve into interactive dashboards that can be accessed on the website.

Discussion: Mission Fulfillment Indicators (MFI) Rating System

Previous Core Theme Indicators system used a 5 point scale (e.g. see [Core Theme 1 Indicator Worksheet](#)):

- 1 = Below Expectations of Mission Fulfillment
- 3 = Meets Expectations of Mission Fulfillment
- 5 = Exceeds Expectations of Mission Fulfillment

NWCCU Standard 1 Rubrics and [IE Rubric](#) uses a 4 point scale (e.g. see [Standard 1.C. Rubric for Student Learning](#)):

- Initial
- Emerging
- Developed
- Highly Developed

We then discussed the MFI rating system, which is used to help determine whether or not the College has met its mission. Historically, the Core Theme Indicators used a five-point scale and the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric and NWCCU have used a 4 point scale, see above. The committee chair recommended moving forward using only a 4 point system. Several members agreed stating that an odd number often encourages people to migrate to the middle when they rate items or answer questions. Another suggested that a 4 point system such as this one will help us create a narrative more easily. By and large all members were in favor of using a four-point system moving forward. This topic will appear on next month's agenda as well to ensure members have had an opportunity to consider their support.

Discussion: [Draft survey of program review for continuous improvement](#)

As part of the business process improvement efforts, a program review survey will be developed and administered. The intention is to find gaps and improve the integration of the institutional program review process with integrated budgeting and planning. The draft

surveys linked above and members are encouraged to provide feedback via comments in the document itself.

Next steps include clarifying the purpose and use of the survey as well as the survey participants. It was noted that an annual review from everyone in the cycle would be to continuous improvement.

APR and APROC have administered surveys in the past; Kate will share survey questions. Because accreditation requirements require continuous and systematic improvement of student learning, student achievement and institutional effectiveness through the program review process, the survey needs to include questions to help answer how programs impact these three areas.

Discussion included the fact that we are behind in basic curriculum work such as shared understanding of student learning outcomes between faculty members teaching the same sections, which may hinder assessment work and impact program reviews. We acknowledged that the program review process is still being developed and will continue to evolve. We talked about the fact that the current program review cycle is 5 years long, which is too long to routinely improve teaching. It needs to include yearly and/or incremental progress reports. This is a common challenge in higher education, but also a reflection of the lack of historical investment in assessment upfront at Lane. Additional professional development in this area is required.

Guidance from our sponsors on scope of work: [Draft IEC Charter](#) (Richard, Paul)

A new draft charter was presented and discussed by Richard and Paul. The charter would be effective from FY 21 – FY 26. Positions authorized to appoint members and membership appointments are listed. The positions authorized include:

- Provost and Executive Vice President
- Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
- Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness
- Faculty Council
- [Tammie, Insert here when information is available]

Members would need experience in areas that the future IEC would oversee, also listed.

Richard and Paul expressed the need for an objective process and system that would help provide vetted and data-based evidence to make decisions such as planning and the allocation of resources. The commission would provide that function. The role of the commission would be to advise and recommend as well as provide data-rich information to decision makers. The role would not include making such decisions (except decisions as directed by the sponsor). The commission would report to the sponsor. Paul stated that although decision-makers would not be required to follow the recommendation of the commission, if they don't, they should be able to articulate why they didn't.

The format of the group would change from a committee to a commission, which would allow the group to oversee initiatives and employ multiple groups (task forces, steering panels, committees, etc.) to perform work. This change would also increase the groups' agency, and expand its influence as well as scope of work. One member asked if these changes support a move toward a business intelligence (BI) model, which was affirmed. What is business intelligence and why is it important? According to [an article on a Tableau web page](#):

Business intelligence (BI) combines **business** analytics, data mining, data visualization, data tools and infrastructure, and best practices to help organizations to make more data-driven decisions. In practice, you know you've got modern business intelligence when you have a comprehensive view of your organization's data and use that data to drive change, eliminate inefficiencies, and quickly adapt...

The task forces, steering panels, committees or other working groups would be created by the IEC based on needs for each of the topic areas (such as program review, data governance, etc.). IEC members would lead these groups and have the ability to recruit members outside of the IEC. The type of employee (classification) would be based on the work to be done. They stressed it was more important to have the appropriate people to do the work rather than choosing people based on classification type alone.

Discussion turned to the number of faculty listed on the new charter, which is two (2). The chair recommended that the number of faculty members are at least the same as the current membership (4). In the subsequent comments within the draft charter, two members suggested that the language stating, "either classified or management" could be updated to include faculty, which would leave flexibility for future appointments. These recommendations would help ameliorate concerns about including too few faculty voices.

Future Meetings:

- Fri, Oct 30, 1:00-3:00
- Thur, Nov 12, 1:00-3:00
- Wed, Dec 9, 1:00-3:00
- Membership, roles & responsibilities
- Refine work plan, as needed
- Institutional program review process

Resources:

- [Institutional Indicators on web](#)
- Link to former indicators, [Core Themes](#)
- [IEC Charter](#)
- [IEC website](#)