

Feedback of Members of Institutional Effectiveness Committee
2020-2021

What has worked well in the IEC?

The review of how everything is laid out and the schedule and cycle of the process has been valuable to get a bird's eye view of the process.

The topics have been useful and beneficial for our work.

Great to get informed about process and changes that are happening. It is moving fast and this is helpful to be able to support our colleagues going through process.

Agendas and meeting schedule are well thought out. It's evident that a lot of thoughtful planning has gone into these!

Breakout rooms are valuable, as they allow us more flexibility to think and share our Individual Ideas.

The process has been very democratic and there's been lots of opportunities to plug into the process.

There are always action items that we need to accomplish, rather than meetings that involve lots of information dumps.

Everyone has been really supportive.

Tri-Chairs have been very organized. Meetings are well-planned.

Breakout groups--it gives all committee members time and space for participation

Feedback of Members of Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2020-2021

What would you like to be different in the IEC?

Use meeting time to work with CPR teams and accomplish the actual work. Have this time/space be for the work of CPR/PRU/ISLO- open lab time for faculty/IEC folks. Collaborative Lab with EC/PRIE support teams available.

Maybe a monthly meeting with some flexible work inbetween meetings that can be done virtually.

Some feel there have been too many breakouts. Makes meeting feel a bit disjointed.

Conduct survey to see how the new process is working for faculty/staff using the new model.

Update/ adapt process based on feedback.

Need some quiet time with program data and materials. This can be during the meeting, or end meeting early to allow for this.

Less meeting in fall? I'm not sure we needed ALL of the meeting sessions semester. cutting back on structured meetings and then opening up the window for teams to meet when they can // when they deem it appropriate

Instructions for breakouts have not always been clear, Sometimes a lot of time is spent figuring out what we are supposed to be doing.

Some breakout groups have been very useful but not all Perhaps limit to 2 breakouts per meeting.

Prefer to have some homework Instead of meeting twice a month.

Feedback of Members of Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2020-2021

How did the program review rollout work for you? What can be improved? (e.g., training you received to support programs; frequency of meetings with these programs; topics for discussion during these meetings; appreciative inquiry; time to become familiar with the program)?

Would like to know program assignments in advance so that we can be better prepared to support.

More flexibility about meeting with teams outside of general meetings.

Less is always more.

The case studies are valuable so folks can start the CPR process with a model in mind.

In terms of next year's programming, more role play might be valuable. For trainings next year, the role play around sample CPRs can be valuable. More hands on case studies for next year is important.

Suggestion 1, create single page info-graphic with the n- process and message widely to campus and on webpage.

Selecting IEC representatives with knowledge of the program might help with guiding programs through CPR.

Some teams never met. Perhaps would be helpful to know which programs will or will not be attending

Unsure how to support CPR teams, not a clear framework for supporting teams.

Receiving training/orientation as an IEC member is very different than leading a CPR team and guiding the conversation.

More broad calendars and Indexes of material to organize the QUANTITY of material?

Examples of how an IEC member can support CPR, not lead.

Suggestion 2, create detailed handbook with step-by-step guide and examples for reference when faculty start their work (or for onboarding of new faculty).