



Rogue Community College

**COLLEGE EFFECTIVENESS COUNCIL MINUTES
JANUARY 24, 2012**

Present: Tracey Davenport, Curt Sommerfeld (phone), Cheryl Markwell (phone), Denise Swafford, Linda Renfro (phone), Mary O’Kief, Acting Chair, Marie Mueller, Recorder, Paul Fisher, Guest

Strategic Planning: Materials provided – (1) Strategic Challenge Questions; (2) Vetting Forms: Maintain/ Revise/Retire; (3) Possible Headers Questions; and (4) directions for SP team meetings #2 and #3.

Paul briefly shared what his *Model Stewardship* team had accomplished today. They asked:

1. What does “modeling stewardship” mean?
2. What should we focus on?
3. How much review of material from the original group should occur and be incorporated?
4. Which of the four challenge questions best reflects of the team’s original challenge questions?

The team spent much of the meeting placing their original challenge questions under the 4 board-approved challenge questions.

Next week, Paul’s group will work on the vetting form, develop a working definition of the challenge questions, and determine if their work needs to appear in every challenge question.

The group felt Challenges one & two (interpreted below) had some overlap and #2 should be first. Curt interpreted these questions as: #1: Who do we want to become? And, #2: Who are we?

Model Stewardship seems not to address Challenge Question #3, so the team is hoping that other groups have that strong student focus.

Possible Header Questions for other Teams to Consider: Outcomes - What do we want the reality to be in the following three years (2012 – 2015)? How will that occur? And, by what means?

↓↓↓↓

Objectives

↓↓↓↓

Are you making progress?

↓↓↓↓

Indicators

↓↓↓↓

Assessment: Success at meeting those objectives will be **assessed by CEC** as an “outside group” in summer, annually.

Questions related to future work: (1) Do we need four teams? (2) Do we need four Core Themes? Ongoing issues to be determined. (3) Do teams have enough time in two more meetings to complete their work?

Note: Following CEC, Mary met with three of the four facilitators to review the vetting documents and discuss next steps. Team meeting #2 will be spent to decide if the existing outcomes appropriately address the four challenge questions and describe the desired reality in 2015. Revisions to the

outcomes will be done as needed. Team meeting #3 will focus on ways to achieve the desired outcomes by vetting the existing objectives (maintain, revise, retire) and by writing new objectives as needed.

Accreditation (Denise): The summary report was forwarded to Executive Team and CEC by Email. There are two recommendations to be addressed in the Fall 2012 Year One, Standard One report. Those are (1) refine and articulate indicators; and (2) publish expected program learning outcomes. Mary indicated this message (Recommendation 1) has been shared with the Strategic Plan Teams. Recommendation 2 has been accomplished.

Other areas of “concern” outlined in the evaluation report include: (1) the way RCC defines Mission fulfillment, (2) how RCC engages student leadership in strategic planning and assessment, (3) the way RCC will improve staff and faculty professional development, and (4) how RCC will generate new resources of all types.

Student Leadership Issues & Student Surveys: Sate is questioning whether we should do SENSE (student survey)—cost, state payments, etc. If the state pays, CEC agreed that RCC should continue with SENSE to see if any changes from the baseline data have occurred. Have we improved? This is a “loop closing” set of data. Curt noted the state IR will determine at the next meeting whether SENSE will be available and paid for. Cheryl stated the CIA group is endorsing a two-year cycle. If that occurs, it will be CCSSE and SENSE. Would that mean that Noel-Levitz SSI falls off entirely? Is RCC using some SSI items to check our success (indicators?) If so, how will that data be collected without the survey? Curt will discuss with Kori. CCSSE’s agency also offers a faculty product (sounds like FSSE--fussy). Its use could be a marker for professional development issues and would allow good comparison and contrast of faculty and student concepts of student engagement. It does not overlap with other surveys as Noel-Levitz and covers both FT and PT faculty.

ACTION: Curt will check with Kori regarding her survey needs and Noel-Levitz content.

CIA has some support of FSSE. IR statewide is VERY supportive. Other colleges pay for it themselves; RCC could use the cost of Noel-Levitz to pay for FSSE if the former is abandoned. Another choice is to ask CCWD to fund it.

ACTION: CEC will take a recommendation to Executive Team after the February meeting regarding, (1) the two-year SENSE/CCSSE cycle; Noel-Levitz decision, following Kori’s and Student Services’ input; and FSSE implementation, if funding is present

Budget: Curtis reported for BAG. A \$2 tuition increased has been factored in to 2012/13 budget and discussions regarding differential tuition are ongoing with possible implementation in the following year’s budget.

Newsletter: Rather than CEC producing a quarterly newsletter, Denise/CEC will send articles to Peter and Margaret for inclusion in *Rogue Matters*. This will be a good venue to inform others on CEC issues.

ACTION: CEC recommends broader distribution of *Rogue Matters* and further advertising of its excellent content. Perhaps it could be sent out not only in Peter’s quarterly email but also separately to the college community? Denise will discuss with Margaret.