

IEC Meeting Notes

September 1, 2020, Time 4:00-5:00 pm, via Zoom (<https://lanecc.zoom.us/j/92423298801>)

Members present: Molloy Wilson, Christine Andrews, Paul Jarrell, Kate Sullivan, Marsha Sills, Tammie Stark, Shannon Ball, Chris Rehn, Ian Coronado, Carla Arciniega, Richard Plott

Announcements:

Barb Barlow Powers has been offered and accepted a management position and therefore has resigned (her classified) membership on this committee. Congratulations Barb!

During this meeting we discussed several Mission Fulfillment Indicators, heard an update from the Institutional Indicator Subcommittee members, voted to change Indicator #6 and heard from our sponsors, Richard and Paul, about the future scope of work for the IEC.

All members present voted unanimously to change Institutional Indicator #6 to, "Credit outcomes for skill development students."

Institutional Indicator Subcommittee Update

Resource: [Institutional Indicators, Benchmarks, Progress Notes](#)

Nov 1, 2020 Completion Date

During the last Institutional Indicator Subcommittee meeting, team members discussed individual indicators, particularly #1 and #6 (ABSE or ESL students who progress to college-level credit courses or complete Career Pathways certificates).

The group suggested that Institutional Indicator #1 (Percent of continuing education students previously enrolled at LCC), deals primarily with repeat students. The group considered a benchmark to maintain or improve the number of repeat students from previous years with 65% as a potential threshold. It might be wise to consider a threshold range of $\frac{2}{3}$ - $\frac{3}{4}$ of students who return. A new survey would need to be developed to address customer satisfaction.

New data for the Indicators #12 and #13 (math and writing) will be available after summer term grades are turned in. The group talked about using comparison data for these indicators.

IEC members discussed the proposed change to Institutional Indicator #6 language. Current language of Institutional Indicator #6: ABSE or ESL students who progress to college-level credit courses or complete Career Pathways certificates.

Proposed new language for Institutional Indicator #6: Credit outcomes for skill development students.

Rationale for change: Metric language (and operationalization) should be adjusted to focus on success of skill development students once they take credit classes, and not about a rate of transition to credit classes. The main reasons for this are:

- 1) Not all ABSE and ESL students have credit work as a goal, and we can't reliably identify which students have that goal.
- 2) Often there is no clearly defined finishing point for skill development work, and many students do not make a simple/linear transition from skill development to credit work.

We discussed the difficulty of measuring successful transitions. We decided that in the future, we may measure transitions as well. **This would be an important step because one of the Strategic Directions is increasing the successful transition of students from noncredit to credit courses.** Also, it's difficult to meet workforce development needs without successful transitions to credit classes. We potentially could use the one year attainment rate in IPEDS, looking at skill development at any level (including back and forth between levels) using FTE equivalency. We all agreed that we should revisit this topic in the future.

All members present voted unanimously to change Institutional Indicator #6 to, "Credit outcomes for skill development students."

Guidance from our sponsors on scope of work (Richard, Paul)

As we move forward toward a post-pandemic learning environment we must face job market changes, bolster evidence-based decision-making and ensure that this committee is involved in the process. It may require new structures to help us better support students and make changes and decisions with ample stakeholder input. The draft vision laid out by Richard and Paul included the IEC potentially acting as a commission rather than a committee with a broad umbrella merging several workflows and areas. Integrated areas may include assessment and accreditation, business process improvement and risk management, data governance (cybersecurity), program effectiveness, program review, strategy and planning. Some examples of business process improvement include automating and streamlining paper-based procedures such as the admissions application; Customer Relationship Management; and software to integrate assessment of student learning, program review, planning and curriculum management. The goal is to improve areas that have a large impact on the College.

These changes would elevate the role of the IEC and that role would potentially include helping define "institutional effectiveness," evaluating the effectiveness of the institution and helping the College become more effective. Institutional effectiveness is more than simply granting degrees to students. The proposed changes would help minimize overlap

in work, increase opportunities for stakeholder feedback and aim to provide proactive rather than reactive responses to environmental changes.

One member suggested that these goals were aspirational goals from the past and asked why the change could be implemented successfully at this point in time. Pollen Richard shared that the College now has stable leadership, including a full Presidential Cabinet, fewer large level restructuring efforts, and a greater sense of urgency. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic and moved to online and distance learning, the College must figure out how to be a more effective institution now or get left behind. It must also be very convenient for students, provide real value to them and the College must advertise its effectiveness. The timing is also good right now because the new Strategic Plan needs is being written and the College just completed an economic impacts study.

Paul, Richard, Pres. Hamilton and her Cabinet are reviewing and revising the Institutional Effectiveness Committee charter and scope of work to optimize it for integrated planning. It is a body that should provide clear and evidence-based recommendations to improve student learning, student achievement and institutional effectiveness. As soon as more information is available, it will be shared with the IEC for feedback.

Future Meetings:

- Sept 17, 10 am - 12 pm
- Membership, roles & responsibilities
- Refine [work plan](#), as needed
- Institutional program review process

Resources:

- [Institutional Indicators, Benchmarks, Progress Notes](#)
- [Institutional Indicators on web](#)
- Copy of final [Institutional Indicators](#)
- Copy of [Institutional Indicators working document](#)
- Link to former indicators, [Core Themes](#)
- IEC [shared drive](#)
- [IEC Charter](#)
- [IEC website](#)