INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 7, 2017, 4:00-5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom

Present: Christine Andrews, Ian Coronado, Craig Taylor, Molloy Wilson, Dawn DeWolf, Kate Sullivan, Karen Ash, Jen Steele, Anne McGrail, Mary Parthemer, Brian Kelly, Matt Danskine, Tammy Salman (by position).

Absent: LCCEA Union Representative (Vacant), Faculty Council Representative (Vacant), Lesley Stine, Ce Rosenow, Rosa Lopez, LCCEF

Union Representative (Vacant). **Notetaker:** Anna Kate Malliris

Guest(s):

Item	Notes
Agenda & Minutes	Agenda approved without change
Approval	February 7 th minutes approved with change to the correct date
Review Core Themes	Review Score Card Model used in 2014 Accreditation Report (Handout #1)
Score Card Model	o This format is standard
	 We set a threshold and then assessed whether the threshold was met
	Need to consider this format
	Review Current Date (Wilson)
	o Reviewed Handout #2
	o NWCCU does not only want to see the numbers but how do you think about the data, how do
	you improve on the numbers if do not meet threshold, etc?
Obtaining &	Who, how, when? (Wilson & Coronado)
Preparing Data	 Using IPEDs data. Colleges are working as a consortium.
	o What process will Lane use, who will collect the data and on what timeline? The Core Theme leads will need to coordinate the work and wrestle with the available data, decide which data to
	use, and interpret the data's meaning/provide context.
	We could determine baseline data and set a threshold and then look as whether we are moving
	toward the threshold, surpassed it, etc.
	 Need to think about who will participate in the process of making these determinations and what format would be used to get this participation.
	o When setting the threshold, should we use a comparison to other community colleges? This
	kind of comparative data is not always available and some of the objectives do not have a clear
	indicator to compare to.

	 We will need to think about who will generate the data and the data needs to be done yearly so that we can be watching the trends and document the work that is being done for improvement. This process will need to be done with each indicator.
	• What support is needed?
	 Leads for each Core Theme need to think about how they will collect the data for each
	indicator and what support they will need in order to do this collection and analysis
	annually or at another interval.
	 Report out at the next meeting.
Score Card Results	Discuss/determine process for gathering input into determining score card results
	• There needs to be a communication plan that engages the entire college with this information. It might
	be helpful for the campus community to see the data because we are lower than other community
	colleges in the state.
	o Governance councils
	o Posters
	o Focused conversations with groups that will be part of the improvement process that is
	developed. They need to understand the data first and that they see their role in addressing the
	areas that they can move forward.
	• Concern that this will expand the challenges by asking for more data and not necessarily knowing how
	to processes it. There needs to be thought about how the data is presented/framed.
ATD/ICAT	Would IEC find results useful?
	• Handout #3
	• These questions will be sent out for feedback and then IEC could use it as a tool to strategize and make
	improvement as needed. IEC could look at this before and after improvements are made and see if the
	strategies undertaken are working.
	• ATD team and sending it out. In May, the ATD coaches will be coming and they will be talking to us
	about the results.
Assessment	• Handout #4
System/IEC Role	Shows the work of the IEC around assessment
	• This is just a draft right now that has not been widely shared.
	• It is hard to see the relationships on this visual. We need input into how these relationships will/should
	function. Will put on the agenda for the next meeting.
Next Meeting	April 4, 2017, from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in Boardroom