

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes
January 16, 2018, 3:30- 5:00 p.m. in Boardroom

Present: Matt Danskine, Ian Coronado, Jane Harmon, Tammy Salman, Christine Andrews, Elizabeth Andrade, Rosa Lopez, Brian Kelly, Jen Steele, Craig Taylor, Molloy Wilson, Carla Arciniega, Gerry Meenaghan.

Absent: Chris Rehn, Terrie Minner, Mary Parthemer, Anne McGrail, Jim Salt, Tammie Stark, ASA Special Projects (vacant), Student At Large (vacant).

Guests:

Notetaker: Anna Kate Malliris

Item	Notes
Minutes- Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 5, 2017, Minutes- Approved with date correction.
Accreditation Update (Kelly & Steele)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Robbins and Ms. Jackson will present report to NWCCU next week. Taylor asked whether there were any accuracy submissions made to the accreditors. Steele responded that there were some corrections submitted upon review of a draft report. Harmon noted that one concern was sustainability, since there are a number of new systems recently created and implemented.
Core Theme Team Check In	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Theme 1: Responsive Community Engagement Met in December, so he hasn't had much time to compile information. January and February meetings are planned, and it is expected that everyone will have their objectives and scores completed and ready for review. Wilson will attend to provide data support. He feels confident that there will be a solid draft after the January meeting, with only minor edits required prior to the February meeting. • Core Theme 2: Accessible and Equitable Learning Opportunities Lopez reported that there is a team meeting scheduled next week. There are fewer objectives in this theme than in others, and a couple of the indicators have already been determined.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Theme 3: Quality Educational Environment Salman and Coronado reported that they are in the process of setting the team’s first meeting. This theme has more indicators than most of the other themes, but they anticipate having adequate time and people to complete. • Core Theme 4: Individual Student Achievement Harbowy and Trier are the leads and neither are on the IEC. Wilson and Taylor both attended their first meeting last week. Wilson reports that generally, people who take part in these meetings are drawn to talking about how to improve the indicators, and are eager to bring in additional content experts and data, but get stuck at that point. There might also be some unreasonable or unrealistic expectations in terms of data available from IRAP. Harmon asked some questions about specific data that was requested and not available. Andrews volunteered to join this team so that someone from IEC would be able to present back. <p>Jen asked teams to consider whether they’d like to provide materials in advance or they would prefer to walk the committee through the materials. The March 6 meeting will be devoted to reports.</p>
Membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASA Special Projects: Tammy Stark? Need to confirm • Student: Brian has reached out to ASLCC but has not received a response at this time • Wilson asked about Anne McGrail’s position as APROC coordinator. He noted that she mentioned that she attends committee meetings to ensure that APROC is aware of work, but is she actually a member? Tammy will follow up with McGrail to confirm and also check-in because she has missed a few meetings. • Jen shared that she anticipates that a committee mission fulfillment report may result in some membership changes to ensure that the right individuals are in the room.
IEC Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Draft Mission Fulfillment Report Outline document (Handout #1)

- Steele clarified that “system inputs” refers to individual groups that reported to IEC in the fall. Andrade asked what the relationship is between this report and accreditation. Steele responded that the report would provide some of the information needed for the year 7 accreditation report.
- There was a question about who is the intended audience for the report. At this time, it is for the IEC use. It will be presented to the board and to the campus community. NWCCU focuses on items 1-6, but the goal of the report is broader in that it also includes recommendations for improvement of systems and structures.
- Wilson asked that all of the reports be uploaded to the shared drive and sent to all IEC members. Harmon said she would follow up with Anna Kate Malliris for a status check. Steele, Harmon, and Malliris will also check in to create a plan for follow up with those who have not yet submitted their reports.
- Steele reviewed the Draft Processing Summative Reports to the IEC document (Handout #2). Lopez asked how the Core Theme teams’ reports were processed. Steele responded that she was able to pre-populate those reports prior to sending them out, and reported “varying degrees” of participation. Andrews asked whether there were representatives from each council on IEC, and it was determined that there are, if all members are present.
- In terms of the reports, Wilson noted that the responses in the reports were all over the map in terms of content, and some were clearly not linked to actual data. Steele said that there are a number of planning groups on campus, and they do not all know how to report on indicators. Lopez said she struggles with the way data is being collected, and whether councils (which are focused on policy) have any connection or collection mechanism to know about all of the activities that are taking place in each core theme area. Although some groups, like the School of Arts and Sciences, make sense and seem organizationally logical, some are not. She is concerned about how the list was created and who is (or is not) represented there. Steele responded that we received similar feedback from NWCCU, and it’s something we should clarify. Harmon volunteered to share some information from other institutions that may be helpful in this process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steele requested volunteers to work on each section, who will be asked to read the same section in all reports. Andrade was concerned that there weren't adequate criteria defined to give guidance to reviewers. Salman, Lopez, Andrade, and Harmon volunteered to participate in a subcommittee to create a base rubric or standard for reviewers to use. Wilson shared that he thought a lot of the submissions are lofty planning statements and are largely subjective in nature. Harmon said that although this process is for the benefit of the IEC, she (and the future ASA VP) and others will likely use them to make decisions in planning. Andrews said that this group should expect a transition time for useful, consistent reports because this process represents a significant culture shift at Lane and it will take people time to grasp the concept. Steele will send out an invitation to all IEC members to participate if they choose.
Institutional Effectiveness Rubric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee created a draft rubric that is based on the NWCCU rubric (Handout #3). The rubric will be used to review the college as a whole, and is not intended to be the rubric used for review of the IEC reports mentioned above. Members present agreed that the landscape format was easier to read and follow. Steele will email the document to all members, and requests feedback so that this document can be used beginning in March or April. Harmon plans to share the rubric with the cabinet and other groups as well. The goal is for individual members to fill out the rubric and collaborate on a single committee report.
Next Meeting	February 6, 2018, from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom.