

Council for Institutional Effectiveness Meeting Minutes – December 20, 2005

Members Present: Larry Gould, Chris Crawford, Paul Adams, Win Jordan, Tom Jackson, Cindy Elliott, Hong Wang (for Dennis King), Shala Bannister, Steve Williams, Jeff Briggs, Joey Linn, Diane Scott, Craig Karlin, Carol Solko, David Schmidt, and Phillip Woodford

Members Absent: Patti Griffin, Dennis King, John Ross, Deb Mercer, Kiley Eisenhour, Bill Smriga, and Larry Getty

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 17, 2006, 3:30-4:30 pm
Pioneer Room – Memorial Union

I. Call to order

- Meeting called to order at 12:30 p.m. by Chris Crawford.

II. Council Actions

- AQIP Forums – Chris reviewed the Summary of AQIP Forums, particularly the strategic issues that were presented to those in attendance at the AQIP forums, which were:
 1. Get to know and understand our stakeholders (systematic processes). Define stakeholders: student stakeholders (potential, current and alumni); also include partners
 2. Do a better job of demographic and satisfaction information from staff, institutionally. Also faculty information is lacking. Need consistent analysis; systematic process needs to be in place.
 3. Better systematic analysis of data. Lots of collection of data. Not a great job of analyzing the data. Then acting on the data. Cognos is a great step forward, but not the only process.
 4. Better tracking of Student Learning Outcomes
 5. Establish criteria for strategic partnerships; evaluation, process implementation; best practice-based.

Chris also reviewed the various issues that were brought forward by participants of the AQIP forums. The Committee members reviewed the issues, combined common issues, through consensus, for presentation to the

committee going to AQIP Strategy Forum. The draft of the issues are listed on the following table:

1	Strategic Issue: Vision: Mobile computing Better systematic analysis of institutional data. Lots of collection of data. Not a great job of analyzing the data, then acting on the data. Cognos is a great step forward, but not the only process.	Technology
2	Hispanic initiative – more concerted, integrated university-level effort; recruiting, marketing, financial resources commitment Affordable Success – preserve higher education accessible; but keep quality of incoming students as far as quality education. Maybe “bridge” programs – high school partnerships Competitiveness of scholarship program Strategic partnerships – challenges – those issues that were written about two years ago have been addressed, and the processes are tightening up. Strategic partnerships – disseminate mission/vision, goals of strategic partnerships Establish criteria for strategic partnerships; evaluation, process implementation; best practice-based; Integration of advising and enrollment process for all students DIVERSITY	Student Recruitment & Retention
3	Better tracking and systematic analysis of student learning outcomes across the university Students need to “learn the system” written in an outcomes manner, outside of the academic environment Writing across the curriculum project Civic engagement, ADP Alignment between specialized accrediting and AQIP, AACSB	Assessment & Accreditation
4	Department OOE (particularly in relation to travel for faculty for recruitment) Academic issues v. infrastructure issues; failing of OOE funding?	Resource Management
5	Reestablish the research activity action project – move to the next step – improve library resources, research performance, probably will be a strong faculty-led effort; grants administration infrastructure (particularly after grants are approved and funded). Expand and sustain initiative for enhanced research opportunities for students and faculty	Scholarship
6	Better communication of how the processes benefit departments; filter down to departments; i.e. online grading (avoid more burden on faculty) Improve communication processes or plans. Improve communication plans institutionally (as indicated by a lack of communication about action plan rejection)	Communication
7	Feedback on action planning process Closer linkage between action planning process and the university strategic plan, including a reporting process on outcomes resulting from funding. Disconnect action planning process and strategic planning process Mission-driven or action plan-driven Empower major segment of academic environment to contribute to strategic goals	Strategic Planning
8	Get to know and understand our stakeholders (systematic processes) Define stakeholders: student stakeholders (potential, current and alumni); also include partners Do a better job of demographic and satisfaction information from staff, institutionally. Also faculty information is lacking. Need consistent analysis; systematic process needs to be in place	Stakeholder Needs

The committee members were asked to go back to Vice Presidents and promote the final list of issues for consideration at the AQIP Strategy Forum.

- 2006 Performance Agreement – There was an extensive discussion concerning the Hispanic initiative goal.

There was an extensive discussion about the present Performance Agreement goals and how long the present goals are in effect. Larry stated that the first reporting goal is FY2005.

The first Performance Agreement goal, Meeting Kansas Virtual Students' Needs and related strategic issues were briefly discussed.

III. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

IV. Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 17, 2006, Pioneer Room, Memorial Union