IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Meeting Notes
September 26, 2024

Present: Janessa Dunn, Jamin Totino, Kelly Sheppard, Corey Freeman-Gallant, Martha O'Leary, David Hargadon, Kam Haq, Mariel Martin, Amy Tweedy, Dwane Sterling, Joe Stankovich

1. The website has been updated to reflect recent assessment projects, committee membership, and accreditation resources.

2. Agenda for the 2024–2025 Academic Year:
   a. Revision of the Institutional Assessment and IE Plan: A working group will convene to streamline and modernize the plan, aiming to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy while enhancing the clarity of assessment documentation.
   b. Post-Graduation Student Outcomes: Currently, multiple departments—including Advancement, Career Development, and academic programs—track outcomes independently. There is a need to centralize these efforts to improve consistency and accessibility.
   c. 2023–2024 Annual Report: Annual assessment reports are being collected. The committee acknowledges the unique nature of administrative assessment and emphasizes its role in connecting data across divisions to provide a comprehensive narrative.
   d. Data Governance at Skidmore: The committee explored the potential for a more integrated data infrastructure and governance framework, addressing the current dichotomy between system-wide and office-specific data practices.

3. HHMI HIE Presentation – Next Steps:
   a. The presentation served as a test of available data layers and accessibility.
   b. It was presented to the Committee on Academic Standing (CAS), with plans for wider campus dissemination.

4. Student Success Focus Groups:
   a. Ongoing collaboration with Student Affairs professionals and students to gather insights on success initiatives.

5. Student Success Project – Next Steps:
   a. The committee discussed how to better capture student employment (e.g., Admissions Ambassadors) as educational experiences. With the transition to Oracle, co-curricular transcripts may be a solution.
   b. Visualizing the Data: Kelly shared prototype dashboards. Considerations include platform selection (Tableau Public vs. Power BI), access permissions, and long-term maintenance.
   c. A proposed plan for integrating student success metrics into the IE Plan will include:
     - Graduation and Retention Rates
     - Cumulative GPA
     - High-Impact Experiences (HIE) data accessible through Banner, including internships, research, civic engagement, study away, and various student programs and leadership roles.

6. Demographic Categories for Disaggregation:
   - Examples include class year, gender (Banner), race (IPEDS), disability status, citizenship, Pell eligibility, Skidmore Need Grant aid, first-generation status, declared majors, AQR placement, first language, and QuestBridge affiliation.

7. Timeline and Community Engagement:
   - Working groups will be established to support efforts in data governance, visualization, post-graduate outcomes, and admissions. Surveys will be distributed to invite participation from campus stakeholders.

Present: Joe Stankovich, Kelly Sheppard, Jamin Totino, Dwane Sterling, Martha O'Leary, Mariel Martin, Amy Tweedy, Janessa Dunn
Absent: Kam Haq, Julie Delay, Corey Freeman-Gallant

1. Joe presented key findings from the Spring 2023 HEDS Alumni Survey, which included feedback from alumni one, five, and ten years post-graduation. The survey achieved a 23% response rate. The full report is accessible online, and Amy recommended slide 34 as particularly useful for illustrating the College's achievement of its Goals for Student Learning and Development. The next iteration of the survey will be administered in 2028.

Table 1: Growth on Intellectual Outcomes
1 = Very little; 2 = Some; 3 = Quite a bit; 4 = Very much

To what extent did your experience as an undergraduate at this institution contribute to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

Careful reading	Effective writing
Critical thinking	Effective speaking
Creative thinking	Teamwork
Information literacy	Problem solving
Quantitative literacy	Integrative thinking

Table 2: Summary Results for Growth on Intellectual Outcomes

	Skidmore College 1-Year Cohort	All Other Alumni in 1-Year Cohort	Skidmore College 5-Year Cohort	All Other Alumni in 5-Year Cohort	Skidmore College 10-Year Cohort	All Other Alumni in 10-Year Cohort
Mean	3.42 ▲▲	3.21	3.18 ⚊	3.21	3.13 ▼	3.19
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.62	0.60
75th Percentile	3.80	3.70	3.60	3.70	3.60	3.70
Median	3.50	3.30	3.30	3.20	3.20	3.30
25th Percentile	3.10	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.70	2.80
Total Responses	91	3,430	97	4,040	130	3,053

The symbols in Table 2 represent effect sizes and indicate the magnitude of the difference between the mean score of your institution's alumni and the overall mean score for all other participating institution's alumni in each cohort. **We only calculate effect size when n ≥ 10 for both the institution and comparison groups. For more information on how we calculate effect sizes, please see the Technical Information tab.**

▲▲▲ Large positive difference   ▲▲ Medium positive difference   ▲ Small positive difference ⚊ = No difference
▼ Small negative difference   ▼▼ Medium negative difference   ▼▼▼ Large negative difference

2. The committee engaged in an in-depth discussion on defining and structuring Data Governance at Skidmore College. Topics included:
   a. Data Ownership and Stewardship: Establishing clear responsibility for various types of institutional data to ensure accuracy, integrity, and policy compliance.
   b. Data Security and Privacy: Emphasizing the importance of protecting sensitive information, with adherence to regulations such as FERPA, HIPAA, and, where applicable, GDPR.
   c. Data Quality: Addressing the need for reliable, consistent, and timely data to support accurate reporting and decision-making.
   d. Data Access and Sharing: Balancing the need for confidentiality with the benefits of informed decision-making by defining access rights and conditions.
   e. Compliance: Ensuring all practices align with relevant legal and regulatory frameworks.
   f. Accountability and Decision-Making: Promoting a campus-wide culture of data-informed decision-making, supported by clear processes and shared responsibility.

3. Additional Points of Discussion:
   a. The committee noted the absence of a defined data request and approval process and emphasized the importance of creating one.
   b. Clarified the need for a framework that defines data ownership and streamlines access management.

c. Identified the challenge of overlapping data categories, which can hinder effective analytics and reporting.

    d. Acknowledged structural difficulties in fostering cross-departmental collaboration, especially when disparate systems are in use.

    e. Highlighted the need for administrative support from senior leadership (e.g., VPs and directors) to implement governance effectively.

    f. Considered beginning with dashboard development as a gateway to broader governance efforts.

    g. Discussed the value of framing data as a strategic institutional asset and developing a shared data philosophy.

    h. Amy shared a set of guiding principles on data management from Haverford College as a potential reference.

    i. The group plans to submit a white paper on data governance for inclusion in the College's strategic plan.

4. Future Business Items:
   - Review of 2024–2025 Academic Year Agenda
   - Revisions to the Institutional Assessment/IE Plan
   - Continued discussion on Post-Graduation Student Outcomes
   - Review of the 2023–2024 Annual Report
   - Follow-up on the HHMI HIE Presentation
   - Updates from Student Success Focus Groups

5. Working Group Updates:
   a. Student Success Visualization Working Group:
     - Kelly Sheppard (Lead), Amy Tweedy, Joe Stankovich, Mariel Martin, Corey Freeman-Gallant

   b. IE/Assessment Plan Revisions Working Group:
     - Amy Tweedy (Lead), Kelly Sheppard, Jamin Totino, Martha O'Leary

   c. SIE Annual Report Draft preparation is in progress.

<p style="text-align:center">**IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes**</p>

<p style="text-align:center">November 14, 2024</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Present: Amy Tweedy, Janessa Dunn, Mariel Martin, Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Dwane Sterling, Julie Delay, Kam Haq, Martha O'Leary, Joe Stankovich
Absent: Jamin Totino</p>

1. The committee discussed the current student information system and the importance of a comprehensive data foundation. A holistic data infrastructure was proposed, with Informatica identified as one potential solution for data integration using an ETL (Extract, Transform, Load) process. SnapLogic was noted as the platform currently used for system interactions. The group emphasized the value of a detailed data system map, illustrating data users and constituent relationships.

2. Strategic Planning White Papers:
   a. Data Foundation Proposal: This paper outlines a cohesive approach to developing Skidmore's data infrastructure to support long-term institutional goals.
   b. Post-Graduation Student Outcomes: Amy collaborated with Nicole Todd to draft a white paper that explores post-graduate outcomes and highlights the role of Marketing and Communications in telling "The Skidmore Story."

3. Student Success Visualization Working Group – A meeting is being scheduled to advance data presentation strategies.
   - Members: Kelly Sheppard (Lead), Amy Tweedy, Joe Stankovich, Mariel Martin, Corey Freeman-Gallant

4. Institutional Effectiveness (IE)/Assessment Plan Revisions – A meeting is being scheduled to further refine the plan.
   - Members: Amy Tweedy (Lead), Kelly Sheppard, Jamin Totino, Martha O'Leary

5. Continued Discussion: Defining Data and Data Governance at Skidmore
   a. Reference Document: Haverford College's Data Management Principles was shared as a foundational resource.
   b. Key Areas of Governance:
     - Data Ownership and Stewardship: Assigning responsibility for data categories and ensuring integrity.
     - Data Security and Privacy: Safeguarding sensitive data in compliance with regulations (e.g., FERPA, HIPAA).
     - Data Quality: Ensuring data is accurate, consistent, and timely.
     - Data Access and Sharing: Establishing clear conditions for access while protecting confidentiality.
     - Compliance: Aligning practices with applicable laws and institutional policy.
     - Accountability and Decision-Making: Creating a structure to oversee data-related decisions and promote a culture of data-informed planning.
     - Data Request Process: Developing a standardized procedure for submitting and approving data

requests.

6. Vision for Data Governance at Skidmore:
   a. A policy will outline data security, ownership, stewardship, access protocols, and institutional guidelines for data use and retention.
   b. The group discussed the broad definition of data as any tracked, relevant information.
   c. Proposed implementation of a ticketing system to facilitate data access and mitigate conflicting narratives.
   d. Emphasis was placed on improving data literacy, with data stewards playing a key role in education and guidance.
   e. Establishing a centralized system to prioritize and analyze data requests more effectively.
   f. Using recurring requests to inform data structure improvements.
   g. Creation of a Data Governance Committee to oversee data access and prioritize institutional needs.
   h. Dwane will gather and share data governance documentation from peer institutions for reference.

<p style="text-align:center">**IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes**</p>

<p style="text-align:center">December 12, 2024</p>

<p style="text-align:center">Present: Jamin Totino, Janessa Dunn, Mariel Martin, Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Dwane Sterling, Julie Delay, Kam Haq, Martha O'Leary, Joe Stankovich, David
Absent: Amy Tweedy</p>

1. Updates:
   a. The subgroup charged with developing visualizations for student success metrics will provide an update in the new year.
   b. The working group tasked with revising the Institutional Assessment Report continues to make progress and will present an updated version to the committee in the spring.

2. Discussion on Draft Data Governance Policy:
   a. The committee reviewed the initial draft of the Data Governance Policy, focusing on several structural and operational aspects.
   b. Key topics included:
   - Defining the role, composition, and authority of the proposed Data Governance Team.
   - Outlining major projects such as data classification, inventory, and the creation of a data dictionary, with IT expected to manage much of the implementation.
   - Establishing a unified process for access requests through a centralized portal.
   - Clarifying the role of the portal in handling requests related to paper records, particularly in areas like Human Resources.
   - Addressing questions around data ownership, including copyright and intellectual property associated with faculty research.
   - Ensuring that confidentiality protocols are in place, with mechanisms to determine access rights.
   - Differentiating between data governance policy and data strategy, while emphasizing broad commitments to data access as a means of supporting strategic, data-informed planning.
   - Outlining expectations for what information will be shared and how it will be returned to requestors.
   - Acknowledging the complexity introduced by interdepartmental overlap and the importance of routing requests appropriately through the portal.
   - Considering whether an internal self-service dashboard could reduce the volume of routine data requests.
   - Recognizing the current lack of visibility into the full range of data requests across campus.
   - Noting the absence of a unified data platform and highlighting the need for better coordination among data architects, analysts, and datamarts.
   - Addressing untracked requests—such as Advancement's need for Chemistry department data on graduates by mentor—as an area for improvement.

   c. Kelly will upload draft documents to a shared Box folder to facilitate feedback and comments from committee members.

3. Spring Scheduling:
   - The committee will finalize the spring meeting schedule shortly, with the first meeting anticipated in February.

Present: Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Kam Haq, Amy Tweedy, Jamin Totino, Joe Stankovich, Mariel Martin, Martha O'Leary, Dwane Sterling
Absent: Julie Delay, David Hargadon, Janessa Dunn

1. Working Group Updates:
   - Subcommittees continue to collaborate on key projects, including revisions to the Institutional Assessment Plan and the development of data visualizations for student success.

2. Follow-Up on Draft Data Governance Policy:
   - The committee reviewed and discussed comments submitted via the shared Box folder, reflecting on feedback from the previous meeting.

3. Scope of Data Governance:
   a. The committee examined the boundaries of data governance, particularly in relation to faculty research, which is protected under intellectual property (IP) laws but still benefits from institutional security protocols.

4. Role of the Subcommittee in Data Governance:
   a. Members reflected on the evolving function of the SIE subcommittee in light of growing responsibilities around data governance.
   b. Questions were raised about whether this subcommittee's charge should formally shift to incorporate data governance oversight or if such a change must be initiated by IPPC.
   c. The group agreed on the importance of maintaining a focus on institutional effectiveness within any expanded data governance role.
   d. A phased approach was discussed, where the subcommittee could initiate the data governance structure before transitioning oversight to other bodies, similar to the Student Success initiative.
   e. Consideration was given to the potential impact of this work on the implementation of a new student information system.
   f. It was suggested that the User Group could assume certain governance responsibilities if provided with appropriate authority, structure, and policy guidance.

5. Drafting the Data Governance Policy:
   a. Emphasis was placed on clearly defining data and its intended uses.
   b. The committee debated whether it would retain ownership of the policy once drafted, or if ongoing management would be assigned elsewhere.
   c. The policy should use familiar Skidmore language to ensure clarity and accessibility across departments.
   d. It should promote responsible use of data to support student success.
   e. Security considerations—including request prioritization and accuracy—must remain central.
   f. Incorporating a "change management" component would help ensure that modifications to data systems or processes are communicated institution-wide.

g. A change log that feeds into the data dictionary was proposed to improve transparency and documentation.

h. The policy should reference existing protocols, such as acceptable use and data security policies.

i. Ultimately, the group concluded that the policy should be distinct from its corresponding procedures and governance structures.

6. Next Steps:
   - Amy and Dwane will collaborate to produce the next draft of the Data Governance Policy for committee review.

IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes
February 20, 2025

Present: Joe Stankovich, Corey Freeman-Gallant, Jamin Totino, Dwane Sterling, Mariel Martin, David Hagedorn, Janessa Dunn, Kelly Sheppard, Kam Haq, Amy Tweedy, Martha O'Leary

1. Overview of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan Revisions:
  - Amy provided an overview of the structure and content of the revised Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan, last updated in 2020.
  - A significant addition to the plan is the incorporation of student success metrics. These are organized across key domains including Academic Success, High-Impact Experiences, and Professional and Graduation Outcomes.
  - The revisions reflect a more holistic and data-informed approach to institutional assessment.

2. Future of Data Governance within the Committee:
  - The committee explored the possibility of formally housing Data Governance within the scope of this subcommittee's work.
  - Should this shift occur, the composition and charge of the subcommittee may be revised to reflect the expanded responsibilities associated with data governance.

IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes
March 20, 2025

Present: Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Dwane Sterling, Mariel Martin, David Hagedorn, Janessa Dunn, Amy Tweedy, Joe Stankovich

Absent: Kam Haq, Martha O'Leary, Julie Delay, Jamin Totino

1. Institutional Effectiveness Plan Revisions:
   - The committee reviewed the latest draft of the Institutional Effectiveness Plan. The document will remain open for comments for an additional week, after which final revisions will be made.

2. Continued Discussion on Data Governance Policy Revisions:
   - The group reviewed and discussed updates to the draft Data Governance Policy, focusing on data access protocols and the treatment of intellectual property.
   - The first two pages of the policy have been revised; the remaining sections will be addressed at the next meeting.

IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes
April 10, 2025

Present: Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Dwane Sterling, Mariel Martin, David Hagadorn, Janessa Dunn, Amy Tweedy, Joe Stankovich, Julie Delay, Jamin Totino

Absent: Kam Haq

1. Review of First Round Edits to Data Governance Policy:
   - The committee reviewed the initial round of edits made to the Data Governance Policy.
   - Focus areas included the Overview, Guiding Principles, Purpose, Scope, and Data Classification and Access sections.
   - Members affirmed alignment with institutional priorities, legal compliance, and access protocols.
   - Intellectual Property exclusions were noted and discussed with reference to the Skidmore College IP Policy.

2. Editing of Policy Content – Part Two:
   a. Data Utilization and Decision-Making:
      - Revisions emphasized the importance of data to strategic planning, student success, and institutional assessment.
      - Language was refined to stress data's role in supporting transparency and operational efficiency.

   b. Data Quality and Integrity:
      - The group revised this section to underscore accountability for data accuracy, completeness, and documentation of changes.
      - Emphasis was placed on lifecycle management and data validation protocols.

   c. Security & Compliance:
      - Clarified expectations around encryption, access control, and routine audits.
      - Training and policy reinforcement were added to strengthen adherence to regulations (FERPA, HIPAA, GDPR).

   d. Policy Maintenance & Compliance:
      - Agreed that the policy will be reviewed annually by the Data Governance Council.
      - Added that updates will be broadly communicated and supported with training and documentation.

   e. Roles and Definitions:
      - Finalized language distinguishing the responsibilities of Data Owners, Stewards, Custodians, and Users.
      - Discussed the role of the Data Governance Council in overseeing processes, resolving conflicts, and ensuring accountability.

The meeting concluded with a plan to circulate the revised draft for final feedback before formal submission to IPPC.

IPPC Sub Committee- Institutional Effectiveness Minutes
April 24, 2025

Present: Corey Freeman-Gallant, Kelly Sheppard, Dwane Sterling, Mariel Martin, David Hagedorn, Janessa Dunn, Amy Tweedy, Joe Stankovich, Julie Delay, Jamin Totino

Absent: Kam Haq, Martha O'Leary

1. MSCHE Accreditation Update:
   - Kelly provided a summary of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) response to the recent Executive Order concerning accreditation. The committee discussed implications and next steps.

2. Submission of the Updated Institutional IE and Assessment Plan:
   - The revised Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Plan has been formally submitted to IPPC.

3. Revisions to the Draft Data Governance Policy:
   - Amy presented updates to the draft policy, and the committee engaged in a detailed discussion regarding its structure and scope.
   - Corey recommended the exclusion of intellectual property data from the policy. Amy will revise the draft to reflect this.
   - The committee debated whether the proposed Data Governance Council (DGC) would serve an advisory or oversight role.
   - The group examined scenarios in which changes to data classification (e.g., Tier 2 to Tier 3 confidentiality) would necessitate consultation with the DGC.
   - Suggestions included modifying Appendix A to replace Vice Presidents as data owners with designated individuals and clarifying the role of data stewards.
   - Strategies for resolving cross-departmental data governance issues were discussed, along with the development of an operating code and appeals process.
   - The proposed membership of the DGC would include core data owners or divisional representatives, and liaisons from key offices such as DOF, DOSA, Registrar, IR, SGA, Advancement, Admissions, Financial Aid, Finance and Administration (beyond IT), the User Group, and HR.
   - The DGC would be responsible for establishing overarching rules for data access request processing, while execution of requests would fall to designated administrators.