

Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, February 10th, 2021

Held via Zoom

Present: Jarett Gilbert, Kristen Kane, Susan Lewis, Justin Smith, Mary Martin, Gerado Cifuentes, Sara Wade

Absent: Gerado Cifuentes

Call to Order: 10:03am

1. Welcome: Welcomed Courtney Judah to the team.
2. Amendments to January 13, 2021 minutes: None to Report

3. Core Theme A

- A1.1 Table
 - Clarification for disaggregated data of 697, when the table & Justin's numbers are adding to 682.4. A difference of almost 15 FTE, stated that 11 FTE was not reported until summer should have been by December.
 - Mary clarified that the enrollment numbers could be slightly different whether Gerado pulled the numbers from RogueNet or DataMart. The unreported 11 FTE was moved to summer term and will then be reported as part of 2020-21.
 - The extra 11 FTE are students enrolled in LDC for 2021
 - Justin verified the 682.4 number based on reviewing RogueNet and D4A
 - Committee is satisfied with moving forward using the 682.4 total. Willing to discuss if there are specifics that Gerado can provide to support the 697 total.
- A1.3 Rubric
 - In the past was measured by FTE but was change last year to headcount. A new target was needed. The committee settled on the following ranges:
 - #1 Below Mission Expectation: 1,500 or fewer
 - #3 Meets Mission Expectation: 2,000 – 2,500
 - #5 Surpasses Mission Expectations: 3,000 or more
 - The new targets are an educated calculation based on previous years and recognition that this year's numbers will be lower than last year reflecting loss of enrollment spring term due to COIVID. No time to research further now.
- A2.1 Analysis: High School Enrollment and accelerated learning opportunities
 - A drop in running start & expanded options, why is the enrollment dropping
 - Thought that students may be taking advantage of earning college credit through College Now since they can attend classes at their high school. Therefore, not a drop in high school students, but rather a rearrangement.
 - Mary suggest that the Running Start and Expanded Options students may not have been tagged correctly. Instead, these students were likely identified as Early College or College Now which are both showing rising enrollment.
 - Action Item: Susan will update the wording in A2.1 analysis.
- A2.2 Enrollment of transitioning High School Students

- Susan questioned the drop in enrollment of development (PSR) Math, Reading and Writing because of the change placement strategies impacted test scores.
- Changes were made in new placement & revised cut scores. The multiple measure placement was not in place in time to impact this measure. Removed multiple measure speculation from the analysis.
- A3.2 Credit enrollment of underserved populations
 - The committee set targets for the revised A3.2 measure, which shifted from % change to total FTE. New targets are:
 - #1 Below Mission Expectation: 750 or fewer
 - #3 Meets Mission Expectation: 780 – 800
 - #5 Surpasses Mission Expectations: 830 or more
 - Jaret explains that enrollment in Community Colleges has drop in the last few years especially in the last year due to COVID.
- All in agreement that Core Theme A looks good with the changes that have been made.
- Action Item: Gerardo and the Core Theme A Committee to provide rewrites highlighted sections in A1.1, A3.1, and A3.2

4. Core Theme B

- Core Theme B is done other than one missing piece of data which shouldn't result in an impact on the rest of CT-B
 - Disaggregated data for B2.1 Student Graduation requires a breakdown of students in the original 2016 cohort. Without this, the data on completions is not informative.
 - Data is expected from ShanShan within the week.
- B2.7 Enrollment in second term following transfer to 4-year university
 - Confirm Enrollment of 2yr to 4yr rubric and targets, explanation
 - Kristen gathered information from Clatsop with a rate 171 out 197, they had a 87% rate and compared to CGCC's 93% and came up with these targets by comparing against Clatsop and CGCC, they chose Clatsop because it is comparable in size to CGCC.

5. Core Theme C Done

- C1.1
 - Dan revised the results for measures that used the Business and Industry Survey to N/A.
 - Now Core Theme C has 5 measures that are N/A, which results in the overall score of Core Theme C being higher than it has been in a long time.
 - C1.4 Agreement in leaving results as Not Available (N/A) even though there is some qualitative data provided in the narrative
 - Core Theme C is DONE.

6. Core Theme Summary Data

- Susan will be able to finish Summary on Core Theme A as soon as the A1.1 measure is resolved but B & C are both done.
- Achievement averages for each core theme shows that CGCC reached mission fulfillment in two of the CTs as well as the college's overall average.
- Explaining the Core Theme Summary Data and no other comments or concerns came up.

7. Other/Wrap-up

- Discussion of disaggregated data in Core Theme B and its possible meaning
 - B1.1 disaggregated data in the table state that there is one with only three
 - Jarett questioned why the three African Americans students didn't enroll in three consecutive terms.
 - Jarett also questions if minority students feel that they connected with
 - Instructors
 - Staff
 - Peers
 - Mary questioned why we are disaggregating this data because what value does it have because there is so many factors that can factor into this data.
 - Larger number of students poses new questions to assist the next level of questions.
 - Maybe we should only disaggregate the Hispanic/Latino students?
 - The IAC picked these categories for this first effort in disaggregating data; we are learning through experience
 - B2.1: Jarett wanted to point out the positives of the Chart on Page 5, Oregon Higher Education Community College Snapshot, being able to compare data against other colleges in the area.
 - B2.2: GED impacted by COVID hard to come up with the final numbers
 - B2.3
 - Jarett talked about the different students that took the GED and how we can gather data on each group that completed GED
 - Mary stated that Homeschool students affect the numbers of GED because anyone can take the GED test at the Campus even if they are not a student of CGCC's GED program. Susan confirmed that the numbers that are in the table are our students in the GED program.
 - Concern that placement test is not placing students in the right course to begin college.
 - Discussion around co-requisite model replacing developmental math courses.
 - Because CGCC is a small college, we will always have small data sets that will require us to proceed carefully in proposing sweeping changes. Attention should be given to trending data which may lead us to ask further questions and conduct specific research with smaller populations.

Meeting Closes at 11:30am.

Next Meeting: March 10, 2021