

# Institutional Assessment Committee

August 8, 2018 10:00 – 11:30 am

Board Room, building 1, The Dalles Campus

## Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Amendments to July 11 minutes? <sup>1</sup>
3. Core Themes Work (10:05 – 10:35 am)
  - a. Goal: Update on data collection and analysis work by CT committees
    - Action Item from July 11: Kristen will contact the HECC for any data they can provide. Done
4. Review and Summarization of 2017-18 Department Review reports (10:35 – 10:45 am)
  - a. Goal: Organize review team and summarization schedule <sup>2</sup>
5. IAC Self-Assessment/Review (10:45 – 11:10 am)
  - a. Goal: Approve Self-Assessment/Review document for presentation to QC <sup>3</sup>  
Action Items from July 11 status update:
    - 1) Mary M will check with the Instruction budget to see if funding is available for an adjunct faculty member to be on IAC.
    - 2) Remove Tama from IAC membership list on website. Done
6. IAC Charter Review (11:10 – 11:25 am)
  - a. Goal: Approve Revised IAC Charter for presentation to QC <sup>4</sup>
    - Action Item from July 11: Susan will update Charter to remove the following: “f) Perform the functions of an Institutional Review Board.” Done
7. Action Items from July 11 for updating the Assessment Inventory:
  - a. Goal: Update on status of Action Items
    - 1) Mary Martin will post the Schedule Survey results to the IAC team drive, not for public viewing.
    - 2) Remove Student Profile from website and replace it with Facts-at-a-Glance. (be sure links are not an issue)
    - 3) Add D4A term summary report, link to DataMart
    - 4) Post VFA report.
    - 5) Remove Library Summary Report Done
8. Wrap-up: Summarize Action Items and Next Steps (11:25 – 11:30 am)

Next meeting: September 12, 2018

Attachments: <sup>1</sup> July 11, 2018 minutes; <sup>2</sup> Example: 2016-17 Department Review Summary;

<sup>3</sup> Committee Self-Assessment Template; <sup>4</sup> updated IAC Charter.

**Institutional Assessment Committee**  
July 11, 2018, 10:00–11:30 a.m.  
Board Room, Building 1, The Dalles Campus

Present: Danny Dehaze, Gail Gilliland, Kristen Kane, Rose Kelly, Susan Lewis, Mary Martin, Gabriela Martinez Mercier, Tiffany Prince, Dawn Sallee-Justesen, John Schoppert, Eric Studebaker, Justin (by phone)

Call to Order: 10:00am

1. Susan welcomes IAC members to the first IAC meeting of the 2018-19 year.
2. May 9, 2018 minutes are approved.

3. Core Themes Work

- a. Goal: Resolve data gathering issues with Core Theme B Measures B2.7 and B2.8

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/OB5q0sPvyMP8TIF5NTA1RWN6XzA?ogsrc=32>

Kristen presented problematic Core Theme B measures.

- It appears B2.7 and B2.8 data is not being tracked at the college or state level. Discussion ensued regarding possible options to gather the numbers.
  - There is a possibility that employment (B2.8) numbers may be provided by:
    - CT Oregon employment numbers
    - Clearing House 2011 has provided these numbers in the past
    - Wage Match can provide this information for a fee (\$600 - \$1500)
    - Prizm will provide the Federal information. These numbers go through the HECC. It was suggested to inundate the HECC for this information.
    - We still have some CTE numbers from ECE, Nursing, Medical Assisting, and EM-Tech. While they are not hard numbers, they can provide some understanding of our placements. We can explain their limitations in the narrative.
  - CGCC has no data for the GPA transfers (B2.7). There is no statewide effort to gather GPA. GPA's must be gathered from the individual institutions.
- Brief discussion ensued about removing these questions from Core Theme B. The questions contain valuable information which would be advantageous to keep in Core Theme B. Conclusion supported by the institutional researcher.
- Kristen is good with keeping B2.7 and B2.8 in Core Theme B.
- **Action Item: Kristen will contact the HECC for any data they can provide.**

- b. Goal: Update on data collection and analysis work by CT committees – due Oct 1

Core Theme A – Lead Eric Studebaker

- Eric reported that the committee is doing really well.
- Areas of concern:
  - Changes will not be addressed until next year.
  - The narrative will be used to explain the concerns.
- ESOL, Community Ed, Child Care Partners are involved, waiting for Pre-College.
- Brief discussion on the use of FTE vs headcount. Headcount was used in the past. Thought that it may be more representative for the non-credit programming.

#### Core Theme B – Lead Kristen Kane

- Kristen reported that Core Theme B is in a good position. Responsibility has been delegated and committee members are on target.
  - B2.6 – Mike Taphouse will need to gather 2017-18 December numbers if we are staying on the same reporting cycle as last year’s Core Themes.
    - It may need to be footnoted that we are using 2017 graduates (2016 comparison to 2017 graduates)

#### Core Theme C – Lead Dan Spatz

- Danny and Gail reported that the committee has not met.
  - There are no requests for changes this year.
  - It was noted that if surveys are to be used as a tool, they need to be sent to industry partners soon.

Core Theme discussion ended with the clarification that the October 1<sup>st</sup> submission deadline is firm. The information that is submitted will be briefly edited and then published.

#### 4. Assessment Inventory (10:35–10:45 am)

- a. Goal: Review currency and completeness of IAC Assessment Inventory

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1x8xjGw99RwyM2c2wfHoeGzdyW4W93Y5xHJhYtXTIVug/edit#gid=1487078226>

##### **Student Profile Page:**

- Schedule survey has been completed.
  - Mary Martin will post the completed survey to the IAC team drive. It will not be made public.
- SENSE will be given 2018-19
- CCSSE will be given every 3<sup>rd</sup> year

The larger schools are talking about dropping SENSE and/or CCSSE; possibly both. The surveys are not required by the state. Be aware of this larger school movement just in case the larger schools no longer participate. This move could impact the CGCC price break.

Brief discussion ensued on the value of CCSSE. It provides a comparative of national benchmarks. It is a very clear cut way of showing our accrediting body that we are self-assessing. The price is right. Student Services shares the results with the college. It can provide some direction for areas of needed improvement.

- Student Profile we are moving away from the Student Profile to Facts-at-a-Glance. The Student Profile needs to be removed.
- JED survey needs to be posted or we can add Shayna Dahl as the contact person. The results will be available in November. CGCC is committed to 7 years of this type of survey.
- New survey suggestions. It was noted that these will not be added to the assessment inventory until they are conducted. The inventory reflects actual, current assessment results.
  - Graduation Exit survey discussed as a possible new best practice.
  - Dual Credit one-year and four-year surveys will be needed.

Institutional Researcher has no additional suggestion. All looks reasonable.

### **Institutional Page:**

- Transfer Playbook Assessment Questionnaire – Even though few people fill it out, it should be kept; possibly it will be reenergized.
- D4A official numbers are available. D4A term summary report needs to be added with a link to DataMart. The report can be done quarterly and monthly.
- Post VFA report, cautious with the accuracy of the numbers.

### **Academic Page:**

- Annual Library Survey, keep.
- Summary Report of the Library, remove.

Institutional Researcher has no additional suggestions. All looks reasonable.

### **Community Partners page:**

- Complete and fine as is.

Brief side discussion ensued regarding survey tools such as Qualtrix, and their funding source. There is a possibility that all surveys could be funded from the Curriculum and Assessment Department (CAD) budget. It would be good to discuss the survey tools (Wufoo, Survey Monkey, Qualtrix) being used, their purpose, efficiency, and if all are necessary tools.

- Action Item: Mary Martin will post the schedule survey to the IAC team drive, not for public viewing.
- Action Item: Remove Student Profile from website and replace it with Facts-at-a-Glance. (be sure links are not an issue)
- Action Item: Add D4A term summary report, link to DataMart
- Action Item: Post VFA report.
- Action Item: Remove Summary Report of the Library
  
- Future Agenda Item: Graduation Exit survey as new best practice.
- Future Agenda Item: Dual Credit survey

## 5. IAC Self-Assessment/Review (10:45–11:10 am)

- a. Goal: Evaluate 1<sup>st</sup> year's work and make revisions as needed
  - IAC has value
  - Efficiency is important
  - Department Review, Core Theme, Institutional Assessment and Strategic Planning, we provide the planning data and have it available for planning.
  - Website is up to date and available

- b. Goal: Determine future projects

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1zKh9slyWdGNXvCgJdmBAqUr-HKRgIrfkKOMsc-F7axE/edit#gid=481177840>

- Data is available we need to make it a goal to get it out to the public.
- Membership
  - More faculty representation on the IAC would be beneficial. Adjunct faculty require paid time for IAC work. Mary will check with the

Instruction budget to see if funding is available for an adjunct faculty member to be on the committee.

- Discussion about current members with scheduling conflicts and unable to attend the meetings.
  - Student Service has sufficient representation so are willing to remove Tama from the membership due to inability to attend meetings because of scheduling conflicts.

- Action Item: Mary will check with the Instruction budget to see if funding is available for an adjunct faculty member to be on IAC.
- Action Item: Remove Tama from IAC membership.
- Future Agenda Item: Removing KFA's

6. IAC Charter Review (11:10– 11:25 am)

- a. Goal: Revise Charter as needed

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xehpKLTtmKYUwq2EgtB81rRTkQoDI-Sag8tM\\_QmGbE/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xehpKLTtmKYUwq2EgtB81rRTkQoDI-Sag8tM_QmGbE/edit)

Upon review of the IAC Charter the committee is in agreement with all areas of the Charter except for the following two areas:

- **Purpose/Responsibilities**
    - The IAC does not function as an Institutional Review Board; “f) Perform the functions of an Institutional Review Board.” Agreed to remove line from Charter.
  - **Reporting**
    - Brief discussion ensued regarding who the IAC reports to, “The Committee shall report to the Quality Council on its activities and any recommendations.”
    - It was determined that the IAC will wait for the new president’s direction in this matter.
- Action Item: Remove the following from the IAC Charter: “f) Perform the functions of an Institutional Review Board.”
  - Future Agenda Item: Should the IAC continue to report to the QC?

7. Meeting adjourn at 11:40am

Next meeting: August 8, 2018

# 2016-17 Summary of Annual Department Reviews (Years 1-3)

## Columbia Gorge Community College

November 2017

### Participating Departments

- Business Office: Bookstore
- Child Care Partners
- Facilities
- Human Resources: Payroll
- Information Technology Services
- Instructional Services, including: CTE, Science & Math; Community Education; Curriculum & Assessment; Library
- President's Office
- Student Services, including: Academic Advising & Career Services; Disabilities Resources; Mental Health & Wellness; Early Alert Pass System; Front Counter; Registrar; Financial Aid; Student Outreach & Recruitment

### Summary of Highlights and Trends

#### **Progress on 2016-17 Department Goals & New Goals for 2017-18**

Reporting on the past year's goals was complicated by departments not having conducted formal reviews in recent years. Therefore, there were not lists of specific goals to which the department could refer. However, clearly departments had goals whether or not they were formally identified in an institutional document. Some department goals aligned with Core Themes and/or were linked closely to institutional strategic goals. One department aligned their goals with NWCCU Standard Two. The scope of goals varied across departments, some having broad goals which were more representative of department mission with sub-goals, others having detailed goals that were more representative of a work plan, and with still others in between.

All departments described completion of or at least progress on most all of their goals. In most instances, unrealized goals were carried over and identified in the coming year's goals. In the case of departments with broader mission-style goals which may not be completed in one year, progress on sub-goals was generally reported and new sub-goals identified for the coming year. At the same time, there were some goals or portions of goals that had to be set aside or postponed. Reported barriers included lack of resources (dollars, staff, equipment), time constraints (usually attributed to the of lack of sufficient staff), and the reliance on external resources (other college departments or individuals and agencies outside of the college). Lack of resources and time were by far the most commonly identified barriers. Difficulties arising from reliance on external resources appeared to come with the understanding that these resources may be stretched thin themselves; however, this potential barrier does point to growth in collaborative activities/actions that require collaborative goals.

## **Progress toward Institutional Strategic Goals**

Information related to institutional strategic goal progress was difficult to determine. A few reports specifically identified how department goals aligned with strategic goals and Core Themes; however, most reviews left it to the reader to interpret how the department goals may move strategic goals forward as well as address mission fulfillment outlined in Core Themes. As the college continues to develop its planning and reporting processes, research on the intersection and alignment of department review and progress toward institutional goals and mission fulfillment would be beneficial.

## **Assessment of Department Operational Functions**

Departments were to analyze, evaluate and report on the performance/adequacy of department operational function areas A-E. Some departments chose to report on all function areas A-J; however, this summary only addresses A-E. Some reviews did not address all of the required function areas.

### **A. Organizational Management & Leadership Structure**

Most departments reported that their organizational management and leadership structure were positive and understood. Generally, departments show a hierarchical structure led by a Chief. Departments vary in size (between two and 177 employees) and complexity; those departments with greater numbers of employees and complexity are generally divided into sub-departments which may function with substantial autonomy and are led by directors or coordinators. Several of these sub-departments completed their own department reviews which became either stand-alone reviews or were attached to/compiled into a larger department review.

A significant organizational and leadership restructure occurred institutionally when the Chief Academic and Student Services Officer position was divided into two positions: Chief Academic Officer and Chief Student Services Officer. This allowed for both Instructional Services and Student Services, at the leadership level, to provide greater focus on each department's issues and needs. Both departments experienced structure change in their organization, adding sub-departments and realigning personnel.

In addition, it was noted that there was growth in interdepartmental organizational structures with the start-up of the Student Success Team, the reestablishment of the Institutional Assessment Committee, and the further development of the Quality Council.

### **B. Personnel**

While all departments say that they have adequate personnel to provide essential services, without exception, all departments are wanting to increase/replace personnel. Most departments report personnel holes that result in either diminished service and/or the significant shifting of workload to others. Many of these positions were vacated in 2014-15 when the college experienced significant budget cuts. Some of the vacated positions have been refilled while others have not. Some hiring searches have failed to find

qualified applicants. Vacancies are in a variety of positions, including: faculty, classified, professional management, and executive leadership. As a result, departments are reporting the potential for inadequacies at all levels. Some departments describe how they carry out cross-training to ensure coverage. And, while there is concern that certain actions or plans may need to be placed on hold due to insufficient staffing, it is important to reemphasize that it is reported that existing personnel is stepping up and taking on greater responsibility to ensure that essential services are not interrupted.

There were some references in the reviews regarding compensation and the offering of competitive salaries. The Human Resource Department reported that it contracted to have a Compensation Survey done this past year to help align the college in a competitive job market. While there are still some positions that had insufficient comparables to complete the entire study, implementation of salary survey recommendations is an HR goal for 2017-18.

Finally, there were a few departments that noted that the hiring of more Spanish speaking personnel would be beneficial and support goals related to being a Hispanic Serving Institution.

### **C. Professional Development**

All departments place value on professional development and recognize it as a means for ensuring that college activities and services are professional and up-to-date. It is broadly considered to be essential in keeping up with current trends, emerging tools, and required skills. Departments provide opportunities for employees to participate in professional development that is specific to the individual, the department, or the institution. For the most part, departments budget a specific amount of dollars for professional development from which they deduct as opportunities arise. Faculty and staff submit requests to their supervisor explaining the value of the activity; the supervisor approves or declines based on the described importance, the cost, and budget availability. No department described having an annual professional development plan or cost break down analysis that would help guide them in determining where the dollars were best spent. Two departments expressed intentions to develop a plan for the coming year, aligning professional development to department goals as well as institutional strategic goals. Some departments expressed concern over insufficient and/or declining funds for professional development.

### **D. Timeliness of Service**

Though difficult to capture, most departments were able to provide anecdotal assessment or general impressions of their timeliness of service. A common theme in describing how timeliness may be observed in a department revolved around accessibility: service hours, available personnel, web resources. Many departments refer to their positive records for meeting external and internal deadlines. Impressions around positive response times to



internal and external inquiries were also mentioned in several reports. Overall, it appears that departments believe that they are providing service to their customers in a timely manner. Several departments did say that they would like to develop some tracking methods in order to have quantitative data to support their qualitative assessment.

#### **E. Customer Satisfaction**

Similar to “timeliness of service,” customer satisfaction is a tricky assessment to conduct, and departments had limited time to develop a means to assess prior to the completion of this year’s department review. The obvious first go-to is to survey customers, asking them how they feel; however, surveys require significant care in their creation and dissemination. The college as a whole has expressed a concern regarding “survey fatigue” and a need for a coordinated effort to ensure that college “customers” are not overburdened and that information gathered is meaningful. Currently, departments identified a variety of actions that have been taken to assess customer satisfaction: limited activity surveys, participation in department activities/events, suggestion box, lack of any negative response, verbal feedback/comments. Most of these assessments focus on a specific activity within the department rather than the department as a whole. It was also noted that satisfaction or lack of satisfaction may bleed from one department to another. In general, the departments were able to report anecdotally that customer satisfaction was positive; however, most would like to develop a method for assessing this metric more concretely.

#### **Big Dreams**

College departments expressed a breadth of dreams, dreams specific to the department, dreams for the college as a whole, and dreams that address visions for community building and growth. As may be expected, the potential of many of the dreams is contingent on funding with departments dreaming of having a specific amount of dollars to follow through on concrete actions (replacement of obsolete fire monitoring system; replacement of classroom podiums; provide iPads to ELT and Board, replace obsolete marketing materials, and many more.) Another common dollar-dependent dream expressed across many departments is additional hiring including specific new positions (Compliance Officer, HR/Payroll Specialist, Curriculum Designer) as well as replacing previously eliminated or unfilled positions. Then there seems to be a jump in the price tag as departments start dreaming about building facilities: a skill center; a state-of-the-art theatre/lecture facility; a built-out 4<sup>th</sup> floor with Board Room and additional office space; an on-campus childcare center; and on-campus student housing.

While it is unlikely that a “Big Dream” does not have some or even significant budget implications, there were some dreams that focused more on process, culture, and image (redesign general education to incorporate service learning, portfolio development, and capstone activity; achieve a culture based on collaboration, innovation and a “can-do” attitude; aspire to be an Aspen award

winning college; easier communication with students; improve the college's reputation in the communities it serves.)

## **Thoughts on Assessment Methodology and Potential Improvements**

This was the first year that departments were required to conduct and submit a written Department Review since the 2011-12 academic year. Modifications were made to the Department Review Template and Guidelines in the winter/spring of 2017. The revised template was presented and training provided regarding its completion to the executive leadership team and department leads at the July 11, 2017 Quality Council meeting. Additional trainings were requested by some departments, and the director of curriculum and assessment obliged. In order to align to the seven year NWCCU review cycle, departments were requested to address all template items for years 1-3. This was essentially a Year 3 report with the addition of a description of personnel in Section One. Reviews were due by September 1, 2017, a less than 2 month turn around. It was recognized that because of limited lead time, departments may not have in place assessment methodologies for some of the areas included on the template, particularly under Section Three: Assessment of Department Operational Functions (D. Timeliness of Service and E. Customer Satisfaction.)

There were some inconsistencies in the completion of the review. Not all pieces of the template are required to be reported on every year; however, some departments completed all sections. Then in other reviews, departments failed to complete all the required sections. A review of the template directions and Department Review training should be done to determine how to best avoid these inconsistencies.

Section Two: Action on Annual Goals & Analysis is the heart of the program review, and in several reviews, this section was incomplete with departments not addressing the bullets listed in the template for this section. Actions toward goal achievement were listed but little analysis nor conclusion regarding overall achievement or status of goal was included. In some cases, data was provided, however, subsequent analysis was lacking. In other instances, judgements/decisions/recommendations would be drawn without substantive data to support them. Data without analysis implies that the department review may be conducted more as an accountability exercise than a process that is meaningful and useful in the decision making process of the department. On the other hand, a lack of substantive data may result in decisions being based on incorrect assumptions which may lead to misallocated resources. Rather than assuming that department personnel understands the inclusion and purpose of data and analysis, it is recommended that some professional development be offered.

## **Committee Self-Assessment (August 8, 2018)**

**Committee Title:** Institutional Assessment Committee

**Charter #:**

**Committee's Mission/Purpose:**

The purpose of the Committee is to collaboratively foster the college wide integration of assessment, planning, and research in order to encourage the continuous improvement of academic programs, academic and student support services, and administrative services at CGCC.

The Committee shall:

- a) Build capacity for assessment and continual, data-driven improvement.
- b) Provide guidance, training and support to all college departments in the development and integration of assessment activities.
- c) Provide institutional data and findings from research and assessment to support institutional planning processes and decision-making.
- d) Be a repository for college assessment data, analysis, and reporting.
- e) Synthesize CGCC assessment activities and provide institutional review regarding quality of service and mission fulfillment.
- f) Perform the functions of an Institutional Review Board.

**Committee Members:**

Susan Lewis (Chair), Tama Bolton, Danny Dehaze, Gail Gilliland, Kristen Kane, Rose Kelly, Mary Martin, Gabriela Martinez Mercier, Tiffany Prince, Dawn Sallee-Justesen, John Schoppert, Dan Spatz, Eric Studebaker, Lori Ufford

**In the last year, how did the committee fulfill its Mission/Purpose? (Please provide specifics. I.e., what, when, and results):**

In its inaugural year, the Institutional Assessment Committee completed multiple actions. Most of this work established procedures for cyclical assessment activity that will continue in the following years. Other activity provided access to existing and future assessment data and information. The committee went beyond its Charter by providing leadership in the 2018-19 strategic planning process.

2017-18 Activity:

1. Committee formation
  - a. determination of scope/mission/purpose/membership

- b. accountability to Quality Council
  - c. charter developed and approved
- 2. Created Assessment & Report Inventory
- 3. Updated Website and did ongoing maintenance
- 4. Department Review
  - a. Updated assessment template
  - b. Provided training and support to department leads
  - c. Reviewed and compiled summary document
- 5. Core Theme Assessment
  - a. Formation of Core Theme Committees
  - b. Review of proposed changes to CT matrix
  - c. Wrote AR and OP for the revision of Core Themes
  - d. Monitored CT Committees and CT data collection and report completion
  - e. Compiled committee reports into single document
- 6. Institutional Assessment and Strategic Planning Summits
  - a. Provided data documents and presentations including:
    - i. Core Theme data and analysis and implications for mission fulfillment
    - ii. Department Review Summary
    - iii. CCSSE summarization
    - iv. Current Strategic Master Plan with updated progress information
  - b. Provided meeting leadership and guidance
  - c. Organized notes and provided information regarding potential budget and resource impacts of proposed actions

**Improvement ideas for the next year:**

1. Build awareness of available data.
2. Include faculty representation on the committee.
3. Continue to research the availability of assessment strategies/tools for measurements that we are currently unable to track and report (i.e. employment placements, GPA of transfer students).
4. Remove IRB responsibility from Charter.

**Submitted by:** Susan Lewis

**Date:** August 8, 2018



## Institutional Assessment Committee

August 8, 2018

### **Establishment and Authority**

The Institutional Assessment Committee is a working committee established by the president.

### **Purpose/Responsibilities**

The purpose of the Committee is to collaboratively foster the college wide integration of assessment, planning, and research in order to encourage the continuous improvement of academic programs, academic and student support services, and administrative services at CGCC.

The Committee shall:

- a) Build capacity for assessment and continual, data-driven improvement.
- b) Provide guidance, training and support to all college departments in the development and integration of assessment activities.
- c) Provide institutional data and findings from research and assessment to support institutional planning processes and decision-making.
- d) Be a repository for college assessment data, analysis, and reporting.
- e) Synthesize CGCC assessment activities and provide institutional review regarding quality of service and mission fulfillment.

### **Committee Composition and Governance**

- 1) *Membership* – open membership, individuals responsible for ongoing assessment activities sought, broad college representation encouraged
- 2) *Leadership* – committee chair: director of curriculum & assessment
- 3) *Meetings* – meetings scheduled at least once per month or as needed
- 4) *Voting* – by consensus

### **Reporting**

The Committee shall report to the Quality Council on its activities and any recommendations.

### **Review and changes to the Charter**

The Committee shall review this charter on an annual basis and recommend any changes to the president.

**Requestor**

Name: Susan Lewis, director of curriculum & assessment

**Approved August ??, 2018**

---

**Dr. Marta Yera Cronin – president**