

Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, November 13, 2019, 10:00 am – 11:30 pm

Board Room, building 1, The Dalles Campus

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Amendments to October 16 minutes ¹?
3. Core Theme Review – continued (begin with Core Theme A if available) (10:05 – 10:30 am)
 - a. Goal: Provide feedback and guidance in completion of Core Themes.
4. Department Review review (10:30 – 11:25 am)
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vVWvtWDYEzfkLxBsgLJfR6oy9oNghwPM>
 - a. Goal: Determine common themes within Function Areas to include in Department Review Summary
5. Wrap-up: Summarize Action Items, Next Steps, Other (11:25 am – 11:30 pm)

Next meeting: December 11, 2019

Attachments: ¹October 16, 2019 Minutes

Institutional Assessment Committee

Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 10:00 am – 11:30 pm

Board Room, Building 1, The Dalles Campus

Present: Gail Gilliland, Kristen Kane, Susan Lewis

Call to Order: 10:0 am

1. Susan welcomes members
2. October 2, 2019 minutes approved.
3. Core Theme Review
 - Core Theme C review. Dan was not able to attend this meeting.
 - Suggestions
 - Follow standard format (see Core Theme B)
 - CT Narrative Analysis
 - ❖ Description of results
 - ❖ Analysis of results
 - ❖ Actions for Improvement
 - ❖ Effectiveness of Assessment
 - i. Tools & methodology
 - ii. Future targets
 - Assessment suggestions do not belong in the Actions for Improvement
 - The C1.1 Effectiveness of Assessment is okay, however, the other Effectiveness of Assessment need revision.
 - C1.1 Analysis of results (Pg 1 2nd sentence of Analysis of results) “While this may reflect greater awareness of Customized Training in the regional business community, ***another possibility is simply that the number reported in the previous year did not accurately reflect the total number of Customized Training contracts***”
 - Why can this be said. What knowledge do you have that the numbers of customized training were not accurate last year?
 - Suzanne did not work on customized training 2017-18
 - **Suggestion:** Defend the statement or remove the statement, if reported elsewhere treat it the same way.
 - C1.1 Actions of improvement (pg2)
 - Do we need to raise the target? Hard pressed to see why so much improvement is needed if we are scoring a 4.
 - “Ed2Go”
 - ❖ how does it work?
 - ❖ How is it a service provided by CGCC?
 - ❖ How will we count “Ed2Go” numbers?
 - ❖ Is this just a referral process given by CGCC?
 - ❖ The linkage to customized training seems nebulous.

- ❖ **Suggestion:** Either remove or explain that it is only a referral service.
- Leadership training by Dana Meyers
 - ❖ Did we hire Dana to present the tool or did we just refer potential students?
 - ❖ Is this a model that we can use to improve this area?
 - ❖ Does it belong in this area?
 - ❖ **Suggestion:** Clarification is needed.
- C1.1 Effectiveness of Assessment (pg 2)
 - Are numbers for Customized Training inaccurate? (see above C1.1 Analysis of results)
 - ❖ **Suggestion:** Defend or remove
- C1.2 Description of results (bottom pg 2 and pg 3)
 - Everything in Description of results is speaking to the Effectiveness of Assessment
 - ❖ **Suggestion:** move to Effectiveness of Assessment
 - Actions for improvement
 - ❖ **Suggestion:**
 - i. move to Effectiveness of Assessment, except for (pg 4) “Finally...” end of 4th line.
 - ii. Leave in Actions of improvement: “Finally, and of special importance: ...” to the end
- C1.3 and C1.4 can repeat in Effectiveness of assessment.
- C1.4 needs to be a different analysis.
 - Actions for improvement would be totally different from C1.2.
 - **Suggestion:** redo Actions of improvement for C1.2 and C1.4
- C1.2, 3, 4 – Ok to
- **Suggestion:**
 - Description of results is generally very small, similar C.1.1, which is very good.
 - C1.2,3,4, Actions for improvement cannot be the same.
 - ❖ Not a logical conclusion.
 - ❖ This would be fine for Effectiveness of assessment, because the survey tool is used.
- C2. 1 & 2 is lumped together. These are actually 2 measures
 - **Suggestion:** split into 2 measures and report out in each.
- C2.1 Analysis of results (pg 5)
 - (line 4) *“However, it is not consistent with anecdotal evidence, when college staff encounter community members through informal conversation who are not aware of the institution.”* Who are you talking to in order to come up with this opinion? Is this opinion 3rd hand and is it acceptable as an unbiased assessment.
 - ❖ This casts doubt on the survey data which is 100% knowledge of the college
 - ❖ This is a biased statement without documentation.

- ❖ Is the survey of no value?
 - ❖ **Suggestions:** remove or defend, preferably remove.
 - C2.1 Actions for improvement (pg 5, line 5 to end) “Additional methods...” belongs in Effectiveness of Assessment
 - **Suggestion:** move statement to Effectiveness of Assessment
 - **Conclusion**
 - Put the correct information in the appropriate area.
 - Use collaboration to write the report so this is seen from many facets to glean the best unbiased report and best practices forward.
 - ❖ More collaborative input into the analysis by a larger committee that would meet earlier and more often for committee contribution to analysis the data and actions for improvement.
 - ❖ More collaboration from Rose, Todd and Nancey rather than just providing numbers.
 - ❖ Collaboration in the analysis is missing.
- Core Theme B
 - Review of core Theme B with Kristen present.
 - B1.2 (pg 3) **Suggestion:** include summer enrollment and compare the difference between B1.1 and B1.2.
 - Do we need to include summer term, because CGCC has such low summer numbers?
 - Why do we lose numbers in the summer?
 - How many people did we lose over summer? Needs the difference between fall to spring and fall to fall.
 - Actions for improvement look at how many of the summer to fall did not come back
 - ❖ Was it completion or summer drift?
 - ❖ Purpose to get a grasp of impact of completers on this number
 - ❖ Is summer drift a large number or insignificant?
 - i. If it is drift then we can put in actions for improvement working on IG3 moving forward on guided pathway work and retention by developing guided pathway to reduce the #of credits, shorten the path, as retention techniques: summer bridge programs, social events, etc.
 - B2.1 (pg 4) Action for improvement – raise the bar
 - B2.6 Possibly, comparing to national norms B2.6 for future targets or changing the measurements.
 - Where are our students going?
 - Top of page 6. We are not changing rubric until establishing OUS numbers.
 - B2.8 (pg 7) Analysis of results
 - **Suggestion:** list of programing that we don’t have records for at this time

- Would like to change to %, rather than numbers in employment
- B3.1 (pg 9)
 - **Suggestion:** Change the wording of “some level of mastery” an instructor identified level of student achievement.
 - Course Outcomes Assessment Part A – do we want to think about changing the wording for “instructor identified achievement”
 - Actions for Improvement
 - ❖ **Suggestion:** list of all common things ...instructor have suggested these things.
 - Tools and methodology, SCE – what is in the rubric
 - ❖ **Suggestion:** remove left over “student perception” language
- B3.2 (pg 14) Shift to measuring change in the 2nd cycle of CLO assessment, moving forward put in the Effectiveness of Assessment

Action Item: The committee will assist in recruitment of more help for Core Theme C Rose Kelly, Todd Meislahn, Nancey Patton.

4. Department Review review
 5. November 13 IAC meeting date and content
 - Finalize Core Themes
 - Department Review – Susan can write the summary – but the IAC needs to read the function areas. Find commonalities that are in the function areas and then send this to Susan
 6. Reminder: Susan will be out of the office from October 23, 2019 through December 3, 2019.
 7. Adjourn 12:00 pm
- Next meeting: November 13, 2019