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
       - <mark>Suggestion:</mark> 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.

- ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> 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?
  - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> Clarification is needed.
- o C1.1 Effectiveness of Assessment (pg 2)
  - ➤ Are numbers for Customized Training inaccurate? (see above C1.1 Analysis of results)
    - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> Defend or remove
- o C1.2 Description of results (bottom pg 2 and pg 3)
  - ➤ Everything in Description of results is speaking to the Effectiveness of Assessment
    - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> move to Effectiveness of Assessment
  - ➤ Actions for improvement
    - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark>
      - 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
- o C1.3 and C1.4 can repeat in Effectiveness of assessment.
- o C1.4 needs to be a different analysis.
  - ➤ Actions for improvement would be totally different from C1.2.
  - ➤ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> redo Actions of improvement for C1.2 and C1.4
- o C1.2, 3, 4 – Ok to
- o <mark>Suggestion:</mark>
  - ➤ 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.
- o C2. 1 & 2 is lumped together. These are actually 2 measures
  - ➤ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> split into 2 measures and report out in each.
- o 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.
  - o 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
  - o 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
  - o Review of core Theme B with Kristen present.
  - o 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.
  - o B2.1 (pg 4) Action for improvement – raise the bar
  - o B2.6 Possibly, comparing to national norms B2.6 for future targets or changing the measurements.
    - ➢ Where are our students going?
  - o Top of page 6. We are not changing rubric until establishing OUS numbers.
  - o B2.8 (pg 7) Analysis of results
    - ➢ Suggestion: list of programing that we don't have records for at this time

- o Would like to change to %, rather than numbers in employment
- o B3.1 (pg 9)
  - ➢ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> 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
    - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> list of all common things …instructor have suggested these things.
  - ➢ Tools and methodology, SCE – what is in the rubric
    - ❖ <mark>Suggestion:</mark> remove left over "student perception" language
- o B3.2 (pg 14) Shift to measuring change in the 2nd cycle of CLO assessment, moving forward put in the Effectiveness of Assessment

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

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