**Mission Fulfillment Committee Meeting Notes**

Date: Monday, May 20, 2019 | Begin: 1:00 | End: 2:00 p.m. | Location: B240 | Recorder: Sara Sellards

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic/Item** | **Notes** |
| 1. **Check-in and review commitments** | No commitments to review. |
| 1. **The latest version of indicators for Academic Relevance and Innovation** | Jason discussed the indicators for academic relevance and innovation. He said that a group was convened using the draft that he and Lisa put together. That draft was rejected. They then convened a group in winter and landed on a new list of things.  Proposed indicators:   1. 80% of respondents to the forthcoming advisory board survey(s) answer the following with “agree” or “strongly agree:”    1. “Program is responsive to feedback and makes changes as appropriate”    2. “The program effectively prepares students for jobs in the industry” 2. X% of assessment survey respondents indicate that they “sought information/assistance about instructional best practices to address ideas raised by the assessment process” 3. Y faculty submit applications for the Foundation’s innovation mini-grant program   Feedback from the committee:   * Mini grants could include multiple faculty or staff submitting an application – also, just because someone submits an application, it doesn’t mean they’ll receive the mini grant * The first indicator only gets at programs that have advisory boards – what about transfer students?   + Post-transfer success measures were discussed – those measures are from the state, and don’t go program by program * Could we find a way to tie into particular programs that our students transfer to? * Any questions on the EYES survey that could connect to relevance/innovation?   + EYES is more around utilization and satisfaction of student services – less around relevance * There was agreement that the first indicator is a good one * It was suggested that the third indicator be changed to not include number of faculty   + Jason committed to revising the indicator to reflect the number of applications, not number of faculty * For the third indicator, it was suggested that we include how many applied, how many accepted, etc. – track that information over time – alternatively, look at how many are implemented   Jason said that these could be things that we adapt. He would like to set the IR crew loose to do some research on these and then look at the results and discuss what the results suggest, continuing to search for alternatives.  Elizabeth asked what the steps are in the process of us as an institution defining what relevance and innovation are. Have we agreed on what it is we are measuring?  Sunny asked if guided pathways is considered innovative. David said that if we look at the documents and rubrics around guided pathways, they call out some innovative practices – for instance, electronic portfolios.  David asked if anyone has such a strong objection with these indicators that they can’t see this moving forward. No one objected. It was agreed that we will run with these indicators for now and dig into a deeper conversation. Jason committed to meeting with Elizabeth, Carol, and others to discuss further. |
| 1. **Forthcoming changes to NWCCU Standards** | Prior to the meeting, Jason sent the committee the [old (current) NWCCU standards](https://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-policies/standards/) and the [proposed revisions](http://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-review/).  Jason explained that the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) opened the process by which it is going to revise its standards over the course of the next 12 months. These standards are what all of the accredited colleges in the region have had to measure themselves against. The initial public comments happened in September of 2018. In the old (current) standards, the very notion of core theme was difficult for people to get their arms around. The draft standards released by NWCCU are significantly shorter than the previous standards. These new standards will go into place in January 2020. We will need to shift to those once they are adopted.  Jason asked if anyone noticed anything new or different in these new standards. It was noted that they have removed discussion of general education and related instruction. They have added statements requiring institutional outcomes. There is less emphasis on standards specific to the Board in the new standards, as well as less specific language around noncredit and community education. There is no mention of core themes. There is specific language around mitigating achievement gaps. There is language around eligibility requirements – we now need to establish indicators that align with indicators of our peer institutions regionally and nationally.    David said that, in our preparation for Year 7, we may want to think about phasing out core themes. He emphasized that the indicators themselves may still be important. We are still supporting the work of the core themes, but what is the structure now that core themes are going away? What is the work we want to do, who supports it, where does it reside?  Jason shared that we received a draft of the mid-cycle visit report. This draft report is written by the visitors, not by NWCCU. The feedback was generally good and largely mirrored what they said in person, which was very positive. Elizabeth requested that a summary of the draft report be shared with the assessment teams. Jason and David said that we don’t want to share the whole report, as it could change, but a summary could be shared. |
| 1. **Potential ramifications related to the changing NWCCU Standards** | Jason requested that committee members dig into the changes and be ready to raise questions, comments, and concerns. We need to make sure that we stay focused on those things we identified as priorities so we can support the work. David pointed out that there is overlap between our current strategic priorities and some of the core themes. |
| 1. **Update on Strategic Planning** | Over the last 5-6 months, Jason received permission to work with 16 folks across campus to discuss planning and recommendations for strategic planning. Now seems like the right time to refresh the strategic plan. The process will start this summer, fall and over the next couple of years. The goal is to have a new plan ready for fall 2021. This gives us 2+ years to do community engagement work and critical thinking. Jason said that we are likely to involve a consultant. There will be a Strategic Planning Leadership Team created to shepherd the work. This team will include a board member, community member, as well as faculty and staff. Jason said that we will make a concerted effort to pull together a lot of the environmental scanning work that has already been done in order to create one integrated environmental scan for the college and let that be a touchstone for future strategic planning work. David said that the charge of the Mission Fulfillment Committee remains the same, but there may be some members of this group that will also be on the Strategic Planning Leadership Team. |
| 1. **Review commitments** | * Jason committed to meeting with Carol, Elizabeth, and others to define the terms we’re using for academic relevance and innovation. * Jason committed to revising Academic Relevance and Innovation indicator #3 to reflect the number of applications, not number of faculty. * Elizabeth will create a summary of the draft mid-cycle visit report to be shared with assessment teams. * Jason asked committee members to review the [old (current) NWCCU standards](https://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-policies/standards/) and the [proposed revisions](http://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-review/). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Future Meetings** | **Start Time** | **End Time** | **Location** |
| **None currently scheduled** |  |  |  |