Performance Indicators Sub Committee Meeting

Minutes

02/26/2013

1. The Performance Indicators sub-committee looked at the draft data in ARCC 2.0. The Committee was given the following link for additional information on ARCC. http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research.aspx.

2. The following bullets were drafted as goals for the Performance Indicators Sub Committee for spring. The committee was told that their input and participation is welcomed.

   - Refine set of college-wide performance indicators and set operational definitions. This can draw on ARCC 2.0, but be adapted or augmented as needed.
   - Collect baseline data.
   - Set numerical targets or goals for the college.
   - Share the information with programs, departments, and committees that have an interest in the information and have ideas on how they can help improve the college’s performance on the indicators.
   - Develop a means to share the information on the webpage “one click away” from homepage if possible.

1. The Performance Indicators Sub Committee is a subcommittee of CPT subcommittee. Barry Gribbons will ask that the Committee will be on the agenda for the next few months to ensure that we share our ideas and progress with them and get their feedback. Committee members we asked to send the group any corrections or modifications to the above.

2. Barry Gribbons will ask Tammie Decker to set up monthly meetings at the same time, but in a larger location to accommodate more people, who may like to
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1. Performance Targets. The numbers from Daylene, with a light modification look good. The modification is adding 5 percent of the baseline percentage to the target, rather than adding 5 percent to the target. (e.g. 1.05 x 74% vs. 74% + 5%).

2. Other Indicators. An additional indicator was added: progression from basic skills to degree applicable for English, math, and ESL. We can use the ARCC 2.0 data and establish a target similar to the above 5 percent increase.

3. Rumor on target setting. One of the other CCCs told Daylene that they heard someone from ACCJC say that targets should be the minimum that the college would achieve and suggested that the set the target as the lowest level of the past 6 years. This target struck the committee as odd and no one had heard similar statements from ACCJC folks. So, we’ll keep to the proposed targets.

   a. Get the word out about the targets, including sharing the targets with CPT, Academic Senate, and Chairs. Statements should probably also be made on how the information should and should not be used.
   b. Encourage reflection strategies that might impact the college’s performance and identify methods for capturing information on the strategies.
      i. We can brainstorm strategies at the next CPT meeting.
      ii. We will want to get feedback from the Program Review Subcommittee on any changes to program review that might make sense.
      iii. Some possible strategies are:
         1. Two-year offering plans
         2. Celebrations for earning certificates
         3. Send chair student contact info when students: apply and indicate major in the area, complete certain requirements, etc.
         4. Reestablish something like the 45 unit letters.
         5. Reach out to people getting close to graduating
         6. In new online student advising, have information on areas of interest and request students to identify areas of interest (programs, clubs, events, etc.) Then use the information to reach out to students.
      iv. In the process of developing the ideas, we will want to engage the academic senate, chairs, and others in the dialog.
5. Below is a revised Table with targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCJC Annual Survey Items</th>
<th>Baseline (2012-13)</th>
<th>Target (2015-16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion (success)-fall term</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Fall to Fall (persistence)-excl isas</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS Degrees AY</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Achievement AY</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Transfers AY</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Indicators from ARCC 2.0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression-Basic Skills to College Level English</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression-Basic Skills to College Level Math</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression-Basic Skills to College Level ESL</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Flex Presentation
   a. Daylene will draft the presentation and send out to the committee for comment.
2. List of Activities
   a. Team should go to each division next year
      i. Ask about rumors
      ii. Discuss indicators
      iii. Discuss activities already in place
      iv. Brainstorm additional activities
   b. We should start sorting the list of activities by level (College-wide, Division, etc.) and by indicator. However, we will not indicate responsibilities at the department level for any of the lists.
   c. The Research Office will work with the committee and other committees on campus to assess progress on the outcome indicators and related activities.
3. Principles of Redesign. This framework by the RP Group might be helpful for framing discussions, or at least a useful set of questions.
4. May Meeting
   a. We will continue to discuss the principles in the Principles of Redesign and look for holes in our current efforts.
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1. Board Presentation, The board presentation in June will include the following:
   - Performance Indicators
   - ARCC 2.0 / 2013 Scorecard
   - Activities in Development

2. Principles of Redesign. In going through the Principles of Redesign, the following ideas were generated to pursue discussions:
   - Accelerate Entry into Coherent Programs of Study
     - Current: Website, Orientation, New Student Advisement, Outreach
     - Future: When students express an interest in an area on the application, they get added to appropriate emails groups and later sent Welcome, possibly including department reception introducing them to clubs, faculty, etc. Comprehensive Student Ed Plan. Interest-specific Events. Career info (from Career Services). Information should be spread out through the first year. Student planning resources should be included.
   - Minimize Time Required to get College Ready
     - Pursue use of grades in high school for placement
     - Math 075, English 096, and PAL address this.
     - Consider 8-week cohort model courses: Packaging classes students need to be successful.
     - Develop 2-year schedule for students. Informs offerings. Guarantees classes.
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• Discussed implications from Student Transcript-Enhanced Placement Project (STEPS) – Need to engage faculty in “how to” implement
• Continued review of the Principles of Redesign
  o Principle #3 – Ensure Students Know the Requirements to Succeed
    ▪ Current Activities Related to the Principle:
      • All requirements are in the catalog and on the website.
      • Online Advisor (“1st semester SEP)
      • Online Program Evaluation (discussed the need to make it meaningful for students)
      • Online Comprehensive Education Plan (not in place but needs to be implemented)
      • Student planning module or the equivalent

  ▪ Needs:
    • Pursue implementing, refining and integrating the systems to be most effective for students to use.
    • Improve accessibility of all systems, especially for academic planning
    • Conduct focus groups on student needs
    • Develop checklists or other in-person opportunities to help students navigate college
    • Look to use first generation information to identify intervention needs

  o Principle #4 – Customize and Contextualize Instruction
    ▪ Needs:
      • Databank of work experiences related to course content
      • Professional development on contextualizing learning
      • Contextualize for both professional and students’ background
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1. Identified the need to add a CTE performance indicator and set a standard
2. Discussed having a standalone Institutional Effectiveness report. Example from Santa Monica College was reviewed.
3. Dr. Buckley would like to see the college fold in strategic goals and program review with the Institutional Effectiveness report.
4. August meeting – Cancelled due to meeting falling during the first week of classes.
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1. Agenda item: Review minutes from June and July
   a. Did not approve the minutes due to low number of attendees.
   b. Reviewed minutes.

2. Agenda item: Update on conversations in the research world on ACCJC expectations for Institutional Standards
   a. Daylene provided an update on the email exchange between herself and other researchers participating in a panel at the upcoming Strengthening Student Success conference.
   b. There is a need for the college to change the nomenclature from institutional “targets” to institutional “standards” to be in alignment with ACCJC’s language.
   c. Several individuals in the community colleges have indicated that ACCJC staff have indicated that their expectation was that colleges set a “floor” for their institutional standards.
   d. After reviewing the standards and the Feds definitions, it appears that College of the Canyons’ approach was a reasonable interpretation. The committee chose to increase our “floor” which was the baseline average by 5 percent. Thus, raising our “floor”, or now referred to as the 2015-16 “standard”.
   e. The committee may want to revisit the completion (success rate) standard as it may be set too high. The previously referenced email exchange included concern that not meeting the standard can be problematic for colleges. However, the standard should be one that encourages improvement as the other institutional standards do.
   f. The committee should pay attention to recommendations issue for colleges having site visits in Fall 2013 to see if any pertain to the Institutional Standards.
   g. The committee requested that the Performance Indicators and 2015-16 Institutional Standards be sent to the Accreditation Standard teams. Barry or Daylene will get them sent out to the standards teams.

3. Agenda item: Continue review of the Principles of Redesign
   a. The committee did not continue reviewing the principles since there was not enough faculty representation.
   b. It was suggested that the committee revisit Principle #4 to see if there are any efforts the college is currently doing that need to be documented. The S4S committee has been engaged in conversations about the High Impact Practices (HIPS) that faculty are using in their classroom but there’s not a inventory or where or to what extent these practices exist across the curriculum.

4. Other business:
a. The committee discussed the value of creating a “culture of inquiry” as described in the RP Group’s publications. In doing so, we need to ensure alignment of success efforts across the campus (e.g., S4S, Roadmap Project, Performance Indicators, etc.)

b. There is a need for broader conversations and engagement of faculty.

c. To help engage faculty more in the conversations and foster a culture of inquiry it was suggested that the research reports be more prominent on the intranet and that updates on data/research be a standing agenda item at the Department Chairs Retreat in the fall and spring. Paul will make this request to Dr. Buckley.

5. Next Meeting Agenda Items - October 29
   a. Approve minutes from June, July and September
   b. Revision of completion standard
   c. Continue review of the Principles of Redesign
   d. Content of Institutional Effectiveness Report