Today we welcomed Richard Plott, the new Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness (EDIE). Richard shared a little bit about his management style which includes characteristics such as empowering people, collaboration, listening to all voices and promoting a “horizontal” organizational structure. Together, Richard and Paul sponsor this committee.

We reviewed the fact that the IEC recently passed a vote updating the definition of “mission fulfillment.” We then briefly discussed the progress in the Institutional Indicators Subcommittee. This subcommittee is currently working as a group and in several smaller work groups to determine data collection methodology for each indicator. The next step is to create benchmarks and thresholds for each of the indicators. This work will continue over the summer.

Resources:
- Mission fulfillment defined
- Copy of Institutional Indicators
- Copy of Institutional Indicators working document
- Link to former indicators, Core Themes
- IEC shared drive
- IEC Charter

Discussion turned to a brief overview of IEC agency, scope of work, responsibilities and decision-making. Paul and Richard agreed that the IEC have authority and agency to complete work that is within the defined scope. IEC work would be driven by Lane’s Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Process. The IEC is responsible for making recommendations to improve institutional effectiveness. The next step is to draft a scope of work and talk about these issues in more depth. This work will begin in one of the next meetings.

We talked about the draft Work Plan, revised elements for clarity and updated dates as well as responsible persons. Unlike in years past, this committee will meet over the summer during which it will vote to adopt /not adopt the work plan.

We talked about the need for communication and engagement. We agreed that short-term needs are focused on sharing the institutional indicators with the campus. Marsha, Brandon, Shannon, Molloy and Tammie volunteered; Marshall will lead the work. Long-term communication needs will be revisited in the future and include topics such as what is the IEC, who is involved, what it does, etc.

Because we were unable to complete our work optimizing the IEC membership, this work will continue in next meetings. Future meetings will also include reviewing institutional accreditation requirements to ensure the IEC work aligns with those requirements.

The next topic on the plan was the work required next year to write the Mission Fulfillment and Institutional Effectiveness Report. The report is written every year to help us determine how and in what ways institutional effectiveness can be improved. The recommendations generated and
outlined in the report are shared with the Administration who is responsible for implementing improvements.

This year we were under the impression that a two-year planning cycle would be embraced and therefore, a report this year was not necessary. However, the two-year planning cycle was not implemented. The end result is that we will have a 2019 and 2021 report but not 2020.

This report is developed using information from councils and College planning groups, accreditation, a self-assessment using the IEC rubric, and evaluation of institutional indicators as compared to thresholds. We discussed the new accreditation rubric for institutional effectiveness available and how it could also be useful information for the self-evaluation process.

The first major steps include requesting update reports from councils and College planning groups, and summarizing the recommendations from those reports. Then we will need to summarize accreditation information, use the rubric(s) and write up narratives related to the institutional indicators. This will be brought together in the final report, the contents of which will also be used for accreditation reporting. We talked about the fact that the Councils may not have been able to create their update reports to the IEC due to interruptions from COVID, but agreed that we still need to request the information.

During our discussion about using the IEC rubric for self-assessment, it was noted that we would be wise to pay particular attention to Standard 1.B.2. Apparently, other institutions may struggle with the new part of this accreditation requirement to compare institutional indicators with regional and national peer institutions. Fortunately, work has already begun to address this and all Standards related to institutional effectiveness (1.B.1 - 1.B.4). These Standards are listed below.

**Standard 1.B.1** The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

**Standard 1.B.2** The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

**Standard 1.B.3** The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

**Standard 1.B.4** The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.