**Mission Fulfillment Committee**

Meeting Notes

April 18, 2018

1:30–3:00 p.m.

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

No previous commitments.

1. **Review of Core Theme Indicators**

Bill reinforced that before we consider a change [to an indicator] to be reasonable, we need to understand exactly what the sources is, the numerator, the denominator, that Lisa Anh can go find the information for us. We need to make sure that we understand it, that we can explain it, that we can find the information and pull the date for that timeframe.

Lisa Anh outlined for the committee what has been discussed for each of the core themes by indicator. She captured changes in a document, which is attached at the end of these notes (pages 2-5).

Lisa Anh explained that we need to provide an ad hoc report to NWCCU by September. We have an internal deadline for the draft in June. This report will describe what our progress looks like on our core themes, looking at recommendations 4 and 5.

David provided an explanation for thresholds: Thresholds that we have established, when we created them for year 1, were functioning as placeholders because we didn’t really have time to do a deep analysis of all of the data that was feeding into these indicators. We have had an opportunity to do a deep dive now and we realize that some don’t work. As the data landscape shifts, we are figuring out where we can have benchmarkable indicators. We are examining national practices. This is much more of a 6-month to full-year process than a one-time thing.

For indicators where we aren’t able to get the data for a while (3.5, for example), we can say that we’re using this data for a while and will evaluate when we see what the VFA data looks like.

1. **Review commitments**

Bill and Lisa Anh committed to work more on this, coming up with a chart that spells out what we think we’re walking away from today with – columns that say measurable, is there a benchmark or external comparator. Bill said that they will email that out.

Proposed Changes to MF Indicators

How to read Proposed Next Steps and Changes:

* Regular text: suggestions from sub-group teams.
* *Italicized text*: notes from IR.
* *Blue italicized text*: notes and decisions during 4/18 MFC meeting

Academic Transfer

| **MF Indicators** | **Proposed Next Steps & Changes** |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1 Credit students satisfactorily attain program learning outcomes and general education outcomes; if not, there is a documented plan for improvement. |  |
| 1.2 Programs are engaged in the institution’s assessment cycle with identified conclusions and actions each year. |  |
| 1.3 Students are ready to succeed at a four year school, based persistence in enrollment at a transfer institution for two terms in the first academic year of transfer. | Look at PSU and OSU data for their native persistence rates to see if our established threshold is reasonable.  *Challenge: persistence for two terms. Not sure how 4-years approach persistence.* |
| 1.4 Students are ready to succeed at a four year school based on *graduation rates at transfer institutions* within three and six years of transfer. | For 6-year: Revise methodology to develop a cohort that matches NSC’s Signature Report methodology |
| 1.5 Rates of completion at CCC and/or transfer to four year institutions within 3 or 6 years of starting at CCC. |  |
| 1.6 Rates of student completion and/or transfer compared to the demographic of those likely to attend college in our service district. |  |

Career & Technical Education

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MF Indicators** | **Proposed Next Steps & Changes** |
| 2.1 Credit students satisfactorily attain program learning and related instruction outcomes; if not, there is a documented plan for improvement. |  |
| 2.2 Programs are engaged in CCC’s assessment cycle with identified conclusions and actions each year |  |
| 2.3 CTE student cohort rates of completion at CCC within three and six years. | Current methodology looks at students with program of intent of CC or AAS.  Proposed change: look at Perkins CTE Concentrator definition to develop a different cohort—students enrolled for credit and completed 18+ program credits within a single program that leads to a degree or certificate.  *Perkins is reported by HECC using D4A Student Yearly file. For this reporting, CCC submits:*  *-Cumulative CORE credits: total number of cumulative CORE credits earned towards declared major (at this institution). CORE credits are credits for courses that are required (specifically named) courses in the degree or certificate program indicated by the student's reported major in the Student file.*  *-Cumulative PROGRAM credits: total number of PROGRAM credits earned towards a declared major. Program credits are any (required or elective) credits which can be applied towards the certificate or degree indicated by the student's major as reported in the Student file for the associated academic year, and includes transferred credits.*  *Keep to using intent data for establishing cohort. Look at Perkins, VFA, other national data to inform threshold.* |
| 2.4 CTE student cohort rates of attainment of *High CTE Credit Threshold* (50% or more of CTE credits relative to intent) within three and six years. | Same as 2.3: Current methodology looks at students with program of intent of CC or AAS.  Proposed change: look at Perkins CTE Concentrator definition to develop a different cohort—students enrolled for credit and completed 18+ program credits within a single program that leads to a degree or certificate.  *Keep to using intent data for establishing cohort.* |
| 2.5 Rates of CCC CTE AAS/Certificate graduates employed 2nd and 4th quarter after exiting program. | At 2nd quarter and at 4th quarter.  *Check WIOA data. Refer to external data to inform threshold (e.g., same threshold for 2nd and 4th quarter)* |
| 2.6 CCC CTE graduates and *High CTE Credit Threshold Completers* achieving employment within one year of leaving CCC. |  |
| 2.7 CTE learners reflect the demographics of those likely to attend college in our service district. | ACCESS to be a Strategic Priority instead  *Leave as is.* |

Essential Skills

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MF Indicators** | **Proposed Next Steps & Changes** |
| 3.1 The percentage of developmental education students in first-time cohort who take and complete writing and math levels required for their degree/certificate intent. | Use VFA measure “Percent of students who became college ready”, which is used for Strategic Priority College Readiness.  *Data is available for both Math and English, and can be disaggregated by demographics.*  *SP Indicator: College Ready within 1 year (leading)*  *MF Indicator: College Ready within 2 years (lagging)*  *Use VFA data.* |
| 3.2 Rates of educational functional [literacy gains for ESL students](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Essential%20Skills\3.2%20Essential%20Skills%20ESL.pdf). | Suggested wording change in the Target/Scoring column to “At or above in 2 or more of the 6 Educational Functional Levels compared to state target.” |
| 3.3 Rates of educational functional [literacy gains for adult basic education and GED](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Essential%20Skills\3.3%20Essential%20Skills%20Skills.pdf) students. |  |
| 3.4 Completion rates of adult high school diploma students within one year. | Change the within one year to two years.  *This has been done already.* |
| 3.5 The rate at which the ABE/GED/AHS [students transition to postsecondary](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Essential%20Skills\Transition%20Rate%20from%202003.pdf) education or training (at least one credit). | This indicator data for ABE/GED/AHS comes from HECC (Transition to Postsecondary measure part of Title 2 Adult Basic Skills under Workforce Investment Act (WIA).  HECC now uses the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) performance measures for Title 2, which does not track transition but now tracks “credential attainment” (secondary credential and postsecondary credential)  *Change indicator to focus on credential attainment or consider using VFA ABE measures.*  *Note in special report that we currently have data, will change approach based on evaluation of [VFA?] data as it becomes available.* |

Lifelong Learning

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MF Indicators** | **Proposed Next Steps & Changes** |
| *Add Overall Access Indicator for CCC* | *Demographics of all students served at CCC are representative of service district population.* |
| 4.1 Unduplicated annual ACE, CTE Supplemental and Community Education Headcount participation credit and non-credit courses that provide career advancement, life and wellness skills, or employment [and % of service district population 18 years and older](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Percent%20of%20Population%20View.jpg) it represents.  [Detail Results](https://public.tableau.com/profile/bj.nicoletti4205#!/vizhome/LifelongLearningIndicator1CommunityParticipation/LifelongLearningCoreThemeIndicator1) | Simplify the wording on 4.1. Even though we can only record populations of voting age participants in community education, we don’t see a need to list details like that in the wording of the indicator.  *Reword: Percent of ACE, CTE Supplemental and Community Education participants are representative of service district population.* |
| 4.2 Annual number of [Workforce Credentials](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Workforce%20Credentials.pdf) | Combine 4.2 and 4.3 to emphasize that grant funding goals are met or exceeded (yes/not, vs counts that fluctuate year to year) |
| 4.3 Annual number of [OJTs](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Data\Depts\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\OJTs.pdf) through Workforce area. | Combine 4.2 and 4.3 to emphasize that grant funding goals are met or exceeded (yes/not, vs counts that fluctuate year to year) |
| 4.4 Annual number of [CEUs](file:///I:\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Customized%20Training%20CEUs%20-%20Sections,%20Enrollment,%20Headcount,%20Total%20CEUs.pdf) granted through Customized Training. | That is to include annual CEU numbers from the entire college, and not just the Customized Training department.  *IR to look at how CEUs are flagged in data warehouse.* |
| 4.5 % of Customized Training students rating the [overall value of the course](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Customized%20Training%20Student%20Opinion%20on%20Value.pdf) through five course rating items as “agree” or “strongly agree” on a six point agreement scale. | Combine 4.5 and 4.6 to look at overall satisfaction with Customized Training.  *Perhaps 4.5a*  *After mid-cycle report, consider looking at 7-point scale for survey.* |
| 4.6 % of Customized Training employers rating the [value of the training](file:///\\clackamas.edu\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Customized%20Training%20Employer%20Satisfaction.pdf) through the survey item “Overall we were satisfied with the training” – and providing a rating of “agree” or “strongly agree” on a six point agreement scale. | Combine 4.5 and 4.6 to look at overall satisfaction with Customized Training.  *Perhaps 4.5b*  *After mid-cycle report, consider looking at 7-point scale for survey.* |
| 4.7 % of Community Education partners [indicating a “strong partnership](file:///I:\Mission%20Fulfillment%20Committee\Core%20Theme%20Work%20Folders\Lifelong%20Learning\Community%20Ed%20Partner%20Mission%20Indicators.pdf)” through select survey items and providing a rating of “agree” or “strongly agree” on a six point agreement scale. |  |