

00:22:08 April Chastain: Can you increase the size?
00:22:33 Sarah Steidl: I was just about to ask that!
00:27:20 Leslie Ormandy: David -- I attended one of the open forums where those numbers of profit loss were shown. Is that somewhere people can see it?
00:29:52 Leslie Ormandy: DAVID -- can you please scroll?
00:30:13 Beverly Forney: I believe he will when he goes through the rubric.
00:30:18 Leslie Ormandy: Good.
00:31:45 Dru Urbassik: I have a suggestion/question about the Labor Market demand.
00:32:52 MELISSA JONES: Is this document someplace where we can see it outside of this meeting?
00:33:31 April Chastain: Leslie, what Jeff shared at the forum was the methodology they were using, not the actual analysis.
00:33:37 Jennifer Miller: Look at the email from Laura Lundborg. It's in the link she sent for today's meeting and materials.
00:34:00 Jane Littlefield: <http://webappsrv.clackamas.edu/committees/collegecouncil/meetings/2020-05-01/Document%20--%20ARE%20Rubric%20ROUGH%20DRAFT%2005.01.20.pdf>
00:34:10 Beverly Forney: Thanks Jane!
00:35:25 Lisa Anh Nguyen: Shalee Hodgson and Lisa Reynolds worked on the LMI work.
00:35:35 Lisa Reynolds: We did this for CTE in Arts & Sciences, also
00:36:02 nora: Is Shalee's document just for TAPs programs?
00:36:55 nora: Thanks Lisa Reynolds
00:37:35 Lisa Reynolds: :) I made the rubric initially for both divisions, we started this work before Shalee arrived
00:38:40 nora: I do not think that using the Bond as criteria is appropriate
00:38:54 Kathryn Long: I agree
00:39:31 Max Wedding: I disagree. It would look like very poor stewardship of taxpayer dollars if we eliminated a program we just spent millions of dollars to shore up.
00:39:59 Lauren McGuire: I agree with Max.
00:40:06 Beverly Forney: The bond is being considered if there were specific monies from the bond going to specific programs. If we state bond monies are going to specific programs, we have to abide by how the taxpayers were told the monies would be spent.
00:40:29 Leslie Ormandy: I agree with Max and Bev.
00:40:39 Kathleen Hollingsworth: Nora, can you tell us why?
00:40:50 Kathryn Long: So this is not applicable for some of the programs being reviewed?
00:40:54 nora: Yes Max- but what about programs like Art and Music which were on previous bonds and what about programs that are successful even though they are not connected to a bond.
00:43:33 Kathryn Long: I am not certain that community support is measurable just by a bond that was passed.
00:43:54 Kathleen Hollingsworth: Support of a bond is a community show of longstanding support for a program that serves the community for the future. Not just the now.
00:44:09 Jennifer Nickell: Are bond measures evidence based? Do they represent community fact or community opinion?
00:45:34 MELISSA JONES: Are we putting this sort of lens on non academic programs, ie student sports, ASG, Vets Center, Community Ed, etc?
00:46:58 Jane Littlefield: I like David's language of "reflects relevant and recent public support for the program" - bond funds could be ONE piece of data. Attendance at CCC-sponsored events, webpage hits (like Clackamas Print), other public-facing efforts we make could all be potential data points. However we gather public feedback.
00:48:08 Willie Fisher: In representing the business community, if we consider low retention rates (i.e. students that don't complete) will we quantify the non-completion due to getting a job; therefore it may be a high demand skill set.
00:48:19 Kathryn Long: Jane, are you talking about something on the document or spoken words?
00:50:25 Kathryn Long: How do the narrative responses connect to the rubric? How are they to be assessed?
00:50:59 Jane Littlefield: @Kat - David just said that, it's not written down...YET! #growthmindset
00:51:38 Kathryn Long: Thanks! Sounds like it would be helpful to have that reflected as we assess!
00:54:20 Kathryn Long: Will there be feedback?

00:54:36 Kathryn Long: Will folks be able to consult with you and the team as they work on the narrative?

01:00:18 Leslie Ormandy: Where would we find the transfer data you just referenced?

01:01:21 Leslie Ormandy: Thanks!

01:02:04 Kathryn Long: Where would a program like ESL fall in this? We don't fit the criteria under "other programs" so I am confused.

01:02:10 eric: How many transfer majors does CCC have? Does giving each major that isn't in the top 20 getting 1 point make sense? Should #21 get the same number of points as those majors that have zero transfers?

01:04:16 Sarah Steidl: Eric, we do not have specific subject transfer majors...like an associate of arts Oregon transfer, History. The degree the students get is either the Associate of Arts, Oregon Transfer.

01:06:11 David Plotkin: Kat - your question about programs that fall outside CTE and Transfer is a good one - and one we still need to come to definitive conclusions about.

01:07:48 Sarah Steidl: Let me rephrase that...If you count the AS degrees that go specific schools, like the Associate of Science Portland State University Engineering we have some. We also have the Associate of Science Oregon Transfer Business and Associate of Science Oregon Transfer Computer, but if students are seeking the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer, they do not get specific subject like History. Does that answer your question.

01:08:02 Kathryn Long: Thanks, David. It would be helpful to better understand how those rubrics will be developed, particularly if the team(s) working on the rubrics doesn't have knowledge of those other programs. We don't want to use criteria that isn't relevant to those other programs.

01:08:10 eric: David, the rubric uses the expression "transfer majors" and says that the top ten will get 5 points and those below #20 will get 1 point. I want to know how many of these "transfer majors" our college has, and if those at the very bottom should get the same number of points as the "transfer major" that has zero transfers.

01:15:00 eric: Sarah, no that doesn't help me understand how the rubric will work in terms of the "transfer majors" row; how the college will determine those "majors" in the top ten and those below the top twenty.

01:15:26 Beth Hodgkinson: When is FYE required? 2021?

01:16:22 Max Wedding: Yes, Beth - Fall of 2021 is the goal.

01:18:29 John Ginsburg: i'm interested in the FAQ link

01:18:37 Guadalupe Martinez: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/17qDAmyFcPqqtcKhMQNsTSJv-_0KpeEKj4c8tKLXi0wE/edit?usp=sharing

01:19:23 Tara Sprehe: Nice job Dustin, Max and Lupe - thank you for all your work on these efforts!

01:19:49 Beth Hodgkinson: Bob, is there a camera focusing on the current construction for the new building? Please share the link. Thanks.

01:20:21 Lori Hall: Yep! I'll post the link.

01:20:58 Lori Hall: <http://dwpwebcams.com/sscc/>

01:23:30 Leslie Ormandy: Are the PTFA Represented on those committees?

01:24:17 eric: David, will you please explain how the row in the rubric that will rate/score "transfer majors" will work. For example, if the college does not monitor "History majors" how will the college determine the transfer majors that will receive 1 point or 5 points? Thanks.

01:33:24 Leslie Ormandy: I would love to know which contract issues

01:33:57 David Plotkin: HOUSE BILL 2998 (2017):
POST SECONDARY STUDENT TRANSFER report from the Higher Education Coordinating Commission

01:34:45 Leslie Ormandy: Can you explain what the Podium refresh entails?

01:35:18 Dru Urbassik: Do you know when you plan to complete these updates?

01:35:55 Leslie Ormandy: Will it make the projectors stop flickering in McLaughlin rooms?

01:36:21 Leslie Ormandy: Please, no.

01:37:25 eric: David, thanks for the House Bill info. I assumed you were ignoring the chat feature.

01:39:21 David Plotkin: Hi Eric,

01:39:56 David Plotkin: I am trying to be respectful of other speakers, so waited to respond till there was a pause.