

IEC Minutes

2.12.19

In Attendance: Tammie Stark, Tammy Salman, Jennifer Steele, Chris Rehn, Marsha Sills, Gerry Meenaghan, Molloy Wilson, Barbara Barlow Powers, Lida Herburger, Anna Scott

1. Approval of January 8 minutes

Approved

2. Core Theme Team Updates - CT Leads

General Notes:

Any indicator revisions for this year must be brought to IEC for discussion and approval by March 5.

As we review and recommend updates to core theme indicators we need to be mindful of feedback from our NWCCU mid-cycle visit: Whenever possible, indicators should be framed in terms of student outcomes, not volume or institutional output.

We have the opportunity to provide supplemental metrics, longitudinal data and narrative/stories to round out understanding of and contextualize indicators.

Core Theme 1- Gerry Meenaghan

The team is still refining indicators and recommendations. They will bring them to the March 5 IEC for discussion and approval.

Summary of team discussions:

Indicator 1.1: Employer feedback on student skill and preparedness for the workplace. Continued questions about how to assess in programs that don't require coop. Exploring how this is assessed elsewhere.

Indicator 1.2: Percentage of majors Lane has articulated to the UO and to OSU.

Lida's team has developed an articulation database that will provide better data. 283 articulation agreements and transfer guides are in the database to date. We will start reviewing this data and consider presenting it as a supplemental metric while we work out processes and benchmarks.

Indicator 1.3: Percentage of Program Review reports that address feedback from advisory boards and other external sources.

Discussion of how to assess quality and substance of external feedback

Indicator 1.4: Cancellation rate for continuing education classes.

No recommendations

Indicator 1.5: Economic impact of Small Business Development Center.

No recommendations

Indicator 1.6: Listenership of KLCC.

Considering adding secondary of supplemental cumulative metric (# of listeners)

Indicator 1.7: Progress toward carbon neutrality.

Considering changing unit of measure to KBTU/square foot (instead of per student FTE). Also exploring a new transportation study

Additional Discussion:

Retired Indicator 1.8: Participation in arts and cultural events.

Discussion of whether or not this should be reinstated

Data might be available through the college's room reservation system

We also might want to consider holistic student support (including things like the food pantry) as part of responsive community engagement.

Core Theme 2- no report

Core Them 3- Tammy Salman

The group has been meeting regularly and feels good about their work and recommendations.

Indicator 3.1: Students report high levels of awareness, and satisfaction with, evidence-based practices on campus.

Recommended Change: Students agree that Lane provides a high quality educational environment.

Rationale for recommendation: We wanted language that would more broadly encompass the current CCSSE data categories and allow for collection of any future identified data relevant to Objective 1. CCSSE is only administered every three years. If this is referring to the AAC&U High-Impact Practices (<https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>) a suggestion is to directly survey students about what a quality educational environment looks like, using the HIPS language.

Data Implications: Will continue to use CCSSE data and will provide more detail in a drop down/supplemental metric. Will explore surveys and additional metrics in the coming year.

Edits Approved

3.2 Percentage of degree-seeking students accessing advising and academic planning to create clear roadmaps to learning and success.

No recommended edits at this time. We are still developing systems for meaningful data, such as an AP code in SARS. We are still developing Degree Works functionality.

We may consider rephrasing the indicator in the future to clarify whether we are measuring a single advising instance or multiple, ongoing advising contacts; or either as long as there is a roadmap/academic plan.

3.3 Percentage of employees who participate in professional development activities related to current thinking about teaching in their fields.

Recommended Change: Percentage of employees who participate in professional development annually.

Rationale for recommendation: There was no data available to support the existing indicator. We have started to develop an annual survey that asks employees to self-report PD. (Types of professional development; employee classification; types of PD: teaching and learning; cultural competency; job skills enrichment; other.)

Data Implications: The team will loop in IR, CCPD, POD, CPD, and FPD in the development and circulation of the survey, which will go out in early March.

Discussion: The IEC asked the team to re-edit the indicator language to allow for multiple measures, not just participation rates, for example: Employee participation in professional development activities that improve Lane's quality learning environment.

-> The team will bring revised edits to the March 5 IEC.

Indicator 3.4: Median contact hours per employee in professional development activities that further develop competencies and skills specific to college role or responsibility.

Recommended Change: Remove this indicator.

Rationale for recommendation: This is redundant if 3.3 is modified and an annual survey instituted.

Removal approved

Indicator 3.5: Percentage of educational **courses** that are mapped to Core Learning Outcomes.

Recommended Change: **3.4** Percentage of educational **programs** that are mapped to Core Learning Outcomes.

Rationale for recommendation: “Programs” restores this indicator to its original phrasing. With the emphasis on program review as the means for planning, it will be more meaningful to track curriculum mapping at the program level rather than course level.

Edit approved

Indicator 3.6: Percentage of educational programs that are systematically reviewed and revised to reflect current disciplinary and industry standards and workforce needs through either the program review process or external accreditation.

Recommended Change: Move to Objective 4. Percentage of **services and programs** that are systematically reviewed and revised to reflect current disciplinary and industry standards and workforce needs.

Questions about the indicator: Does this indicator belong here given 1.3 [*Percentage of Program Review reports that address feedback from advisory boards and other external sources*] also deals with Program Review? Also, should the indicator report on all program review, academic and non-academic? Presumably all services and academic programs contribute in some way to the quality of Lane’s educational environment.

See notes for 3.8 below.

Discussion: Support of including all programs and services in this indicator. Support of moving it to Objective 4, which deals with systematic planning, analysis and coordination efforts that are teaching and learning focused.

Regarding 1.3: this is distinct in that it is connected with responsive community engagement and external sources. We need to be sure the external sources are valid, high quality, and provide meaningful feedback.

-> The team will move this to Objective 4 and bring back to IEC March 5 for final approval.

3.7 Percentage of educational courses that are assessed against Core Learning Outcomes.

Recommended Change: **3.5** Percentage of educational programs that have developed and implemented a student learning assessment plan.

Rationale for recommendation: It is unreasonable to expect that all courses can or should be

assessed against Core Learning Outcomes. Assessment should be contextual and based on program needs. Therefore, it is more reasonable to expect each program to have an assessment plan that is discipline-specific and aids in continuous improvement of the program and, by extension, courses within that program.

Edit approved

3. Other Work Plan Items

We will need to do some work between meetings over the next couple of months. Jen will send links and guidance out to the committee so members can contribute to discussions of:

Reports to IEC

Mission Fulfillment & Institutional Effectiveness Report

Communications and Outreach

Accreditation

IEC Charter Review

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 5, 3-4:30 p.m.