**Mission Fulfillment Committee**

Meeting Notes

November 6, 2017

11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

1. **Check-in and review commitments**

Commitments were reviewed. The [list of committees](http://webappsrv.clackamas.edu/committees/) on the website has been updated to include Mission Fulfillment and that page has been updated to include the mission/charge, subcommittees, and membership: <http://webappsrv.clackamas.edu/committees/MFC/>

1. **Data Quality**

BJ facilitated a conversation around data quality and how it comes into play as we approach academic core theme indicators, the CTE indicator and the dev ed indicator. Clackamas has had minimal data quality, not unlike other community colleges. There is not a lot of data to work with (minimal standard data set). The data can tell you who graduated and who is enrolled in which courses, however it can’t tell you about the student’s program intent. In the past, we have have very little to go on to describe our students – we had date of birth (so age was reliable), but we didn’t have a standardized way of getting race and gender (due to there not being a standard application process). BJ pointed out that it’s not like Clackamas is bad – we are very similar to other community colleges – and we did those things for the right reasons, to not put up barriers for students. There has been a change in culture, moving away from a culture of education focused on outcomes. In 2015-16 the data integrity group put together a student information update that asked demographic and program intent questions, so for the past two years, we have had these new data. BJ shared that the integrity of data gets better when the treatment is wrapped around the ask. In 2016-17, there was a data improvement quality grant from the federal government. Starting in 2017-18, the front door ask is tied to a mandatory treatment (an orientation) and student demographics are collected at the front – this better serves students for their success. We are now coming at it from the cohort perspective. David pointed out that with this, we are able to have some things that we can on within a quarter and between quarters. We will be able to learn more, such as degree intent, transfer intent, program intent, race and gender, veterans’ status, and English language learner status.

1. **Overview of new results available for core themes one and two: Part A**

Elizabeth shared the process that the assessment committee is in. They were asked to discuss targets for the indicators and spent about an hour on it last week. The committee hasn’t yet discussed what success looks like, but started with a structured conversation around what we want to see in an assessment system and what criteria we need. They are in the infant stages – last year was the first time we had a program assessment report, almost establishing a baseline. Elizabeth discussed what this means for setting a target – how do you identify a target when you’re still at the baseline stage? Then there was conversation around indicators 1.1 and 1.2 (and 2.1 and 2.2, which are essentially the same):

* 1.1: Are students actually attaining outcomes – learning what we want them to learn – documented plan in place – doesn’t end with just achievement combining that with improvement is in the spirt of best practice for assessment – we have programs that are gathering information, those programs are setting the bar for what is acceptable – those folks that are looking at outcomes, if their students are meeting the minimum they set, if they aren’t, they’re doing something about it
* 1.2: How many programs are engaged in a process – what’s the critical low point and what’s our aspiration? We could be focused on have precise learning outcomes data or we could be focused on faculty development. What do we want as a college? Committee is trying to promote an engagement – faculty identified last year is having a chance to collaborate and talk about teaching and learning – if we value that, we can document how much faculty engagement is happening – aggregate that information – want 100% engaged, not sure where 80% came from, but it is good to have a number for those that will hold us accountable – David’s vote is to stay with where we’re at for now

David pointed out that we want to clarify in 1.2 what “engaged” means, as it is different than 1.1. BJ suggested explaining to the Board and others in regard to 1.1 and 1.2 – where we’re at and what they mean.

1. **Overview of new results available for core themes one and two: Part B**

BJ indicated that she will go over Data quality presentation with Sue.

1. **Academic Transfer and the last CTE Indicator**

BJ discussed indicators 1.6 and 2.7, which read differently. She asked the committee if this was intentional – if we need them to read differently or do they read the way we want them to. David explained, for 2.7, that we have a lot of CTE learners who don’t complete their degrees, so it would be a smaller number. It is the question of learners vs. completers. Lisa Anh talked about the issues of access and completion. David said that it could be broken up into 1.6a and 1.6b if we wanted. He explained that we need to show that we are an institution providing equitable access and sufficient support for underrepresented populations. Are we helping the student that come to Clackamas complete with an eye toward equity and closing achievement gaps?

1. **Role of Subgroup Leads**

This topic will be covered at the next meeting, on November 15.

1. **Commitments and next steps**

Future meetings:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Start Time** | **End Time** | **Location** |
| Wednesday, November 15 | 9:00 a.m. | 10:00 a.m. | B237 |
| Wednesday, November 22 | 2:00 p.m. | 3:00 p.m. | B237 |