



IR Council Winter Retreat

December 14, 2011

9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Classroom 5B in the Rio Tower at Rio Salado

Members Present

Cindy Almendarez - DO

Keith Cantor - DO

John Catapano - DO

Laurie Cohen - SCC

Mary Day - CGCC

Christina Del Rosario - MCC

Cathy Hernandez - GWCC

Linda Hughes - SCC

Sue Kater - GWCC

Ajit Kelkar – DO

Janet Krause – DO

Brandon Mesanko - PVCC

Kerry Mitchell - EMCC

Sherri Ondrus - DO

John Roth - GW

Tracy Salter - DO

Donna Silber - DO

Alka Arora Singh - GCC

Jim Waugh - GCC

René Willekens - EMCC

Genevieve Winters – PC

Theresa Wong - CGCC

Welcome and Introductions

Donna called the meeting to order at 9:15 am and introduced Sherri Ondrus. Each member present introduced him/herself and participated in the ice breaker activity.

Overview, Board Metrics

René Willekens introduced the topic of the new metrics by providing a brief history. The Maricopa Governing Board identified new outcomes and then a committee was convened to create metrics. To the extent possible, the metrics committee tried to tie the Maricopa metrics to the Vision 2020 (V2020) which is a state version of the national Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA). Last July the IR Council met at a working retreat to come to a better understanding of the metrics and create the methodology. However, since that time, the VFA has changed its cohort to all incoming students rather than a new student cohort.

The intent of this working retreat was to design the format of the new monitoring report and create queries that can be used for these new metrics. In February, 2012, the November 2011 Board Report with the old metrics will be presented to the Governing Board and closed out. This will be followed at the same meeting by a presentation on the new outcomes and metrics. Institutional Effectiveness will create a report with as many of these metrics as possible. The primary goal of the IR Council Winter Retreat was to create a format and queries to facilitate this Governing Board Report.

Tracy Salter talked about how the Council would proceed with this project. She provided a handout with a complete list of the metrics organized by data source. She identified those measures for which she believed data could be provided by February and those measures for which reporting would need to be delayed. Among the measures that could likely be reported in February, she grouped together those measures that could be based on the same or similar queries. The goal of the group was to create as many viable queries as possible.

Tracy indicated that she reviewed the VFA technical guide. The VFA has decided to use a cohort of students who are at an institution for the first time. This differs from a new student cohort in that it may

include transfer students. The V2020 wanted to align with VFA as much as possible and Maricopa will be reporting on the 2010-11 year for the V2020 in June 2012. Carrie Kisker is going to convene a small group to make decisions regarding the V2020 metrics, including whether the cohort for these state measures should be changed to align with the national group. Tracy asked the Council if the Maricopa measures should also be changed to include transfers in the cohort. Nothing in the board document makes requirements for the cohort. Currently, Maricopa doesn't have a transfer table or data for prior years, so cohorts would have to be developed back to 2004, and this will take some time. It is likely that these cohorts will not be developed by February. Hearing no dissent, the decision was made to add transfers to the table for future reporting. However, for the February report, only the new student cohort will be used.

Tracy then led the group in a discussion concerning issues associated with specific metrics. For example, Item 3B1 appears to be a question regarding performance gaps. How will this information be presented? In February we might want to give the Governing Board definitions or descriptions of the type of data we will be able to provide in November. A suggestion was made that we might be comparing different success rates. A recommendation was made to go ahead and gather these data and then determine how to show the differences or gaps. It was pointed out that we need to have a better conceptual understanding of what the Governing Board wants to know.

Two metrics dealing with college-level data were considered on pages 5 and 6 of the handout. Tracy asked whether these data could be collected for reporting in February. For example, some of the data for item 2Bi2 are collected as part of Carl Perkins. Can colleges gather this information by mid-January? Mary Day responded that she doubted this information could be gathered by then because it involves faculty who would be essentially unavailable until mid-January. As a result, this item will not be included in the February report.

Items 4A4, 4C2, 4D2, and 4D3, on page 5-6 of the handout, requested information about various services and opportunities provided to students, such as programs, events and activities open to the community, number of activities that address political or global issues, study abroad programs, and service learning opportunities. The CCSSE collected responses about service learning, so that information could be used to report in February.

In the handout, the measures listed on page 7 through the end of the document were things that could be reported in February. Each of these metrics would be assigned to a group to create a query. If the group felt that a measure could not be reported by February, they were requested to report it to the IR Council later in the meeting. The groups were requested to write queries in such a way that they could be used for the district and also by individual colleges. Further, the groups were instructed that the V2020 is expected to stick with IPEDS categories.

As the groups determined what data needs to be compiled and how it should be presented, they also needed to consider the reporting time frames. It may be appropriate to change time periods from semester to annual data or vice versa. For example, item 4A2 will be changed to an annual reporting time frame. Along the same lines, item 2A1 requests job opening data that is generally available in the Spring of each year. We should use the appropriate time frame and then footnote the time period the data was collected.

Some other changes to items:

- V2020 is still working on a state-wide definition of item 4A1 which asks for the percentage of high school graduates who enroll directly in community college within eight months of completing high school. ASU used Clearinghouse to address a similar question.
- Contrary to the information on the tables associated with the items on page 17, we will present information on percentage of students, but not percentage of enrollments.
- For item 4A2, the criteria of “with no college experience” will be removed from the methodology.
- For the items on page 19, the Council considered which population of developmental students should be used: those referred to developmental coursework, those enrolled in developmental coursework, or those who successfully completed developmental coursework. The Council decided to use the same metric as that used for NCCBP which uses a population of students who have successfully passed developmental course work in the subject.

Tracy then provided information on how to use “decode” statements to create queries that are useful for both district- and college-level data.

Break

The Council took a short break.

Work Session

When the meeting reconvened most individuals were assigned to one of five work groups, as follows:

1. What will the report look like? Also how to present survey data?
Alka Aurora Singh, Mary Day, Sherri Ondrus, John Catapano, René Willekens
2. Templates and wording to submit college items on pages 5-6. (Perhaps provide examples.)
Sue Kater, Jim Waugh, Laurie Cohen
3. Query group for course completion (page 13) and course type (page 17)
Kerry Mitchell, Cindy Almendarez, John Roth
4. Query group for cohort course completion (page 14) and graduation rate (pages 15-16)
Genevieve Winters, Brendan Mesanko, Janet Krause, Linda Hughes
5. Query group for developmental education and general persistence (pages 18-19)
Christina del Rosario, Theresa Wong, Donna Silber, Cathy Hernandez

Keith Cantor, Ajit Kelkar and Tracy Salter served as floaters.

The Council members separated into their work groups to address the issues assigned to them.

Lunch

The Council adjourned for lunch at 11:45 am and returned at 1:00 pm.

Continue Work Session

The work groups re-convened to continue working on the assigned tasks.

Report Out by Groups

Each group took a few minutes to report their results to the Council. The format group suggested a document that started with a two to three page summary with an overview of the large trends. This section would be followed by additional detail that would include graphs (perhaps using Sparklines). The final section would include greater detail.

The templates work group presented their templates, and the Council discussed the categories. Questions arose about whether to include community restaurants, business community events, and service-learning versus a voluntary service component of a class. These issues were not resolved at the retreat, and these questions likely will not be reported in the Feb 2012 report.

Each of the query groups reported on their progress in creating the queries and what problems were encountered. All groups saved their work on the queries to the shared drive.

Data Sharing

Laurie Cohen introduced the topic of data sharing. She would like to simplify the process by which colleges can obtain permission to use another college's data for comparison purposes. Currently, when a college uses another college's data, the IR Office at the first college will request permission from the second college to use their data. This process is time consuming and responses are often not received in a timely manner, making it more difficult to prepare time-sensitive reports. In addition, these data are often public.

The Council agreed that if the data are publicly available, it doesn't make sense to restrict their use by other Maricopa Colleges. It also doesn't make sense to restrict any kind of aggregated data where information are not identifiable by college. What kind of protocol do we want to establish for releasing other data? Do we want to allow blanket approvals or requests such as, "I will use these data unless I hear otherwise from you within X amount of time?" Do we want to make sure the data go to the IR Office before or at the same time they are released? The Council may want to visit further to establish a protocol that will work for all of us.

Handouts

University Transfer Education and General Education
Query Example

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 18, 2012 from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm at the Rio Conference Center.