

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes
November 7, 2017, 3:30- 5:00 p.m. in Boardroom

Present: Matt Danskine, Ian Coronado, Dawn DeWolf, Anne McGrail, Rosa Lopez, Tammy Salman, Mary Parthemer, Jen Steele, Craig Taylor, Molloy Wilson, Elizabeth Andrade, Chris Rehn, Carla Arciniega (by Phone), Gerry Meenaghan.

Absent: Christine Andrews, Terrie Minner, Jim Salt, Tammie Stark, Brian Kelly, ASA Special Projects (vacant), Student At Large (vacant), Faculty Council Rep at Large (vacant).

Guests:

Notetaker: Anna Kate Malliris

Item	Notes
Minutes- Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 11, 2017, Minutes- Approved with change • August 1, 2017, Minutes- Approved without change • September 5, 2017, Minutes- Approved without change • October 3, 2017, Minutes- Approved without change
Debrief Mid-Cycle Accreditation Visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Format was good and stimulated good conversation ○ Helped with understanding of the Core Themes and how to move ahead with the Core Theme Team work ○ They affirmed that Lane is on the right track and that the work was done because it is meaningful to teaching, learning and student success, and not just for compliance- adds to sustainability of the work ○ Visitors were really glad about the broad level of involvement; especially the faculty ○ Want more around CLOs and the processes that may be better if they are simplified; as well as the presentation of the information ○ Check for layering and redundancy and eliminate where possible ○ Lead to a conversation about how the pieces fit together; governance and core themes, etc. ○ Clarification that everything needs to be connected to the Core Themes and mission fulfillment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the meeting with Diversity Council meeting, the question arose about how the work aligns with the Core Themes and that was challenging for the group to answer. Sally also made the observation that diversity language was missing from the mid-cycle report. She noted that the training was disconnected from student outcomes and in all of the Core Themes. ● Timelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Receive draft report by end of November ○ Review for factual accuracy ○ Sent to commission ○ January commission makes their findings ○ Could be additional ad hoc report in one year, could just take us off warning with suggestions to be ready for Year 7, or not enough progress and still on warning with ad hoc report in a year. ○ Impression that we made substantial progress and we still need to consider simplification of the process and presentation, alignment of processes, and focus on and direct connection to Core Themes. ○ The visitors will provide focus as we move toward the 7 year report
Systematic Improvement/ Rubrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reviewed Handout #1 ● Includes a first idea of how we might do systematic improvement ● Question about how the 3 parts to systematic improvement align with each other ● Develop a working group to combine the different rubrics into a Lane Institutional Effectiveness Committee rubric that we could use to see where we are and where we want to be. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tammy Salman ○ Craig Taylor ○ Jen Steele
Process/ Timeline to Review IEC Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Still need 5 reports and some concern that it was not a very helpful exercise ● Calendar says that by the end of winter term, would share our initial findings ● Could be on the accreditation shared drive but may be best to just email them to the group next week ● Need some clarity about what we are looking for and what constitutes mission fulfillment; especially since some of the data is missing ● Committee to look at what the material looks like and try to give some direction about the outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jen Steele

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dawn DeWolf ○ Carla Arciniega <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Goal is to create a mission fulfillment report from the reports that are submitted
Core Theme Teams Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Core Theme Team leads are recruiting for members ● Orientation meeting will be held on Nov. 14th ● Teams will establish a threshold, based on what, look at the data, and determine if we met the threshold on a 1-5 scale. There could be a bare minimum threshold and then aspirational goals. Can look at it as a threshold as a 3 (meets the expectations) and the aspirational goal as a 5 (exceeds expectations), with a 1 being below the threshold. <i>Discuss more in December.</i> ● IRAP person will be with each team when they meet to help with the meaning of the data ● Try not to analyze the data to death. The focus needs to be on the analysis and how will deficiencies be addressed. Work with the information you have and then move toward analysis and recommendations. ● We will not be changing the indicators at this point. It would be good to have the rationale statement for each indicator available so that the team can move forward. Can acknowledge in the 7 year report that certain indicators are not working well and that we will be looking for a better indicator for the next report. ● We may need to add leading indicators because we are heavy on lagging indicator so that we are more focused on student success indicators. ● <i>In December, we could discuss whether some of the indicators that more closely define mission fulfillment.</i> ● It would be good to have a template for the report so the team members can see the outcome and it would create consistency across themes and indicators.
Next Meeting	December 5, 2017, from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom.