

ACC Meeting Name: **Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

Meeting Date: April 19, 2013

Time: 1:30pm to 3:30pm

Location: HBC, Room 301

Co-chairs: Soon Merz and Ron Johns

Members Present: Bonnie Spanogle, Chris de la Ronde, Daniel O'hanlon, FC Caranikas, Kelly Stockstad, Kirk Kelly, Marcus Jackson, Margaret Reid, MaryJane McReynolds, Ron Johns, Soon Merz and Willie Martinez.

Support Staff: Judith Wynn and Rhonda Boyce

Members Absent: Ann Palmer, Bailey Kral, Charles Quinn, D'Maris Allen-Mierl, David Borden, Denise White, Hector Aguilar, Jason Vidrine, Jim Nelson, Kathleen Christensen, Kathy Walton, Kimberly Hawkins, Laura Ore, Lola Cowling, Lyman Grant, Michiel Davis, Mike McCarthy, Mike Midgley, Nancy Laudenslager, Rich Griffiths, Robert Bermea, Steve Clary and Sylvia Galvan-Gonzales.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Soon welcomed members to the meeting.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of Minutes from last meeting

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Mary Jane moved to approve the minutes as written. Margaret seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Decisions/Actions: The minutes for the November 16, 2012 meeting were approved.

Agenda Item 3: SACS Discussion

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: As a review leading to our AMP discussion, Soon said that when the SACS reviewers were here for the on-site review, they commented that our processes were too complicated and asked us to streamline them. They also thought the processes we already had in place (DAC, IPR, QIP, SSR, etc.) were independent processes, not understanding that the QIP is a part of each process and that all process were designed to be integrated into assessment. All of these processes have been folded into the current AMP process.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 4: Academic Master Plan – Developments and Implications

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Soon reported that as part of responding to SACS, new organizational structures are being proposed for the AMP process. First, a new unit is being created to coordinate planning and assessment for the instructional and educational support areas under the Provost. The DAC and IPR would then be moved under this unit. In addition, the SSR subcommittee would be pulled out from under the IEC and become the SSR Committee. With these changes, it has taken away about two-thirds of what this committee does. At this point of the agenda, Soon asked Daniel to give his report on Shared Governance Committee Restructuring, agenda item #7, to give us an update on how this activity is progressing.

Daniel reported that the President tasked council chairs (ACAC, SSC, ASC and SGC) to review their work products, attendance and subcommittees and determine the extent to which they support and measure student success. Part of what prompted this look at the committees (approx.129), was a complaint by Student Life that

they could not fill all of the SGA spots on these committees. It is anticipated that there will be changes to the current committee structure.

Soon then continued the conversation regarding how these changes may affect the IEC and opened up the floor to discuss reasons for continuance of the committee. Highlights of the discussion are as follows:

- a. The issue of poor communication among committees came up and Soon suggested perhaps we need a committee of the committee chairs to share information.
- b. We could review data about institutional effectiveness.
- c. We could serve as a bridge between the Strategic Plan and day to day operations.
- d. We will need a concrete focus of what we do.
- e. We would need to do a work plan at the beginning of each year.
- f. We could become a clearinghouse of assessment activities.
- g. If we change our function, the process would be to go to ACAC with a proposal and if approved, it would go to the President. If that is approved, the committee composition would also change (less faculty involvement).
- h. For IEC to continue, it must help achieve student success, and the committee work products need to be measurable.

Decisions/Actions: It was the consensus of those present that there are valid reasons to continue the IEC and further discussion of committee functions will be needed.

Agenda Item 5: Strategic Plan Discussion

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: Soon reported that she presented the Strategic Plan to the board on April 1st. The Strategic Plan will be presented to the board again at a later date for approval. The board indicated that they would like to have the Strategic Plan presented again when the AMP is presented.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 6: Discipline Assessment Cycle Report

Presenter: Ron Johns

Discussion: Ron reported that the DAC will meet in June to discuss what improvements need to be made in the process. He indicated they will be looking at new assessment software to replace CurricUNET. Soon commented that because our assessment processes are not yet fully developed, any issues with the current process could migrate to the new software. She also noted that when DAC moves to the provost's area, so will the responsibilities for maintaining whatever software is used.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 7: Shared Governance Committee Restructuring

Presenter: Daniel O'hanlon

Discussion: Daniel presented his update; included in agenda item #3.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 8: Announcements

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: No announcements

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.

Agenda Item 9: Adjournment

Presenter: Soon Merz

Discussion: The meeting was adjourned at 3:13pm.

Decisions/Actions: No decisions at this time.