

## IEC Meeting Agenda & Notes

June 14, 2020, Time 1:00-2:00 pm, via Zoom

Members present: Shannon Ball, Molloy Wilson, Richard Plott, Brandon Gibson, Chris Rhen, Paul Jarrell, Tammie Stark, Christine Andrews, Kate Sullivan

Members not present: Grant Matthews, Carla Arciniega, Ian Coronado, Marsha Sills, Student representative, Barb BarlowPowers

Today we talked about the need for communicating about the institutional indicators. We agreed that broad communication is necessary, that a communication plan will need to be developed and then communication activities carried out. Molloy, Shannon, Brandon and Marsha indicated willingness to work with Tammie on this effort. Additional volunteers for this work group are most welcome.

We began to develop an initial list of benchmarks for each institutional indicator; see the [Institutional Indicators, Benchmarks, Progress Notes](#). Some of the indicators have been used before and thus we can use or update the existing benchmarks. However, some new benchmarks will need to be created. This work will continue during the next meeting.

Committee members were asked to help complete the [Institutional Indicators, Benchmarks, Progress Notes](#) document. Each person that leads a work group in the institutional indicators subcommittee should expect to:

- List their name and their team members' names (column E)
- Write a summary of next step and due date (column F, G)
- Update information regularly (before each IEC or subcommittee meeting at the least)

The accreditation rubrics related to institutional effectiveness were briefly mentioned. All members are expected to be knowledgeable about the rubrics and standards which can be found on the [accreditation website](#) and at the end of this doc.

Below is a recap from the June meeting which outlines part of the work for next year.

Next year we need 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 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 Standards related to institutional effectiveness (1.B.1 - 1.B.4) 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.