

## Achieving the Dream

Minutes 12/08/2015

Achieving the Dream Meeting

December 8, 2015

1:00 – 2:00 pm in CEC2406

Attendees: Mark Deitrick, Melissa Denardo, Jessica Diehl, Hope Gossard, Brian Hayden, Sarajane Hill, Gloria Jacobs, Beth Jansto, Jan Kaminski, Walter Lukhaup, Sandy May, Aaron Meyerl, Chris Reber, Don Sedlacek, Mary Jo Slater, Vicki Suehr, Lauren Susan, and Katie Thomas

---

The meeting was co-chaired by Jessica Diehl and Jan Kaminski.

Jan Kaminski requested the minutes from our last meeting be review for accuracy, no revisions or additions were requested. Brian Hayden motioned for acceptance and Mark Deitrick seconded the motion. Jessica Diehl is contacting marketing to have the file placed online.

In response to suggestions from AtD coach, Mary Fifield; Jan announced the addition of Don Sedlacek as faculty chair for our committee.

Jan presented the “Job Descriptions” created for the Co-Team Leads, Core Team Members, and Data Team Members; although the Core and Data teams currently act as one, we will be moving towards some separation – asking members to self-select an area of interest – as we begin to work through the spring semester. All in attendance reviewed these and were asked to bring proposed edits for the next meeting.

Dr. Reber asked if there should be a greater focus on disaggregating data in the core team description, later finding item #1 on the data team responsibilities to meet this need.

After reviewing the member responsibilities, some discussion began regarding our ability to identify students as belonging to particular groups within the data (Low income, Minority, Veteran, TRA/Displaced worker), for all of these instances we are tracking the presence or number of these students in some way and would be able to formally review their participation/success to determine if achievement gaps exist between these groups and the general student population at CCBC. The small number of TRA students (~12) was mentioned and Sandy May indicated that there are other displaced worker who aren't attending under the government funded TRA program, that we may not be able to track.

Hope Gossard inquired as to the ability to notate the presence of Deaf students or others with different abilities, as she recently learned that American Sign Language (ASL) uses a different grammatical structure than spoken American English. Walter indicated that a UDEF field in Jenzabar could be used for this purpose, though traditionally notification is done by Supportive Services Personnel to the instructor individually.

## **Achieving the Dream**

**Minutes 12/08/2015**

Additional discussion ensued regarding the usefulness of disaggregating data to show success rates of those with different abilities. We are able to track the cohort who have self-identified to supportive services. Melissa Denardo indicated that some individuals with Learning Disabilities do not speak up/identify themselves as needing support. Jan indicated that approximately 100 – 150 students identify themselves to supportive services, with the majority of these being individuals with cognitive and not physical disabilities. Sandy May mentioned that students on her school tours are very vocal, speaking freely of their need for services and advocating for themselves when visiting Liz Marshall in supportive services.

Jan asked that we invite Liz to participate in the committee during Cheryl Herrington's absence.

It was determined that if we so choose, the cohort of those with different abilities can be broken down by type of ability.

Jessica led a review of the data gathered during October's professional development day:

Many groups indicated an interest in showing results by age, part time vs. full time status, and course modality (face to face, hybrid, and online) as well as a need for more descriptive information (definitions, a legend, the reason behind these measures).

Katie Thomas summed up the major requests as being Clarity, Context & Color – we will be working to update the existing data presentations (measure charts/graphs) to incorporate these ideas. Parameters for 'unsuccessful' were mentioned to include W grades.

Dr. Reber brought up that he had heard comments during Professional Development day regarding the potential of looking at the performance of students of color to be construed as prejudicial or racial profiling. It is important that we discuss and identify that the purpose of this data collection and review is not to treat anyone differently, but that it is our responsibility to understand and identify ways to support students who may be struggling academically. Individual groups have differing backgrounds that can influence their performance in a scholastic setting and by tracking data from many angles, our ability to determine where an achievement gap exists, helps us to work on methods to close that gap.

Brian indicated that the approximately 10% of CCBC students who are African American is a considerably sized group of our student body and that at times, due to reporting parameters (First time/Full time attendance) there have been occasions when the school is reporting out that no one from this demographic group completed their studies/graduated within a specified term. That alone speaks to the need to find ways to support these individuals.

## **Achieving the Dream**

**Minutes 12/08/2015**

Hope mentioned hearing on the news that CCBC is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> in PA among Community Colleges, though no one knew what the ranking was of – Brian indicated that it was taken from a national poll result with the PA schools listed in their order from that.

Based on feedback from Professional Development Day, the team will review how gateway courses are being defined at our January or February meeting with the possibility of updating what courses are being reported on to include Science, Technology, or Arts related courses. At that time we may also review how we gather/determine a student's intent to better understand data on the number of graduates.

Beth Jansto requested that we include information on students who have and haven't taken preparatory coursework before taking the gateway math courses (algebra and statistics) this data is available and can be brought into the graphical representation for review.

A short discussion on inclusion of parental status of students (do they have children) that this is not information that we have or could amass for all students and as such would not be reported.

Due to the type and amount of sub-groups being considered, a clustered bar graph is likely to be employed for ease of determining gap/differences between groups.

Mary Jo Slater requested that the graphical displays be similarly scaled as the current ones drop off at different points on the axis. Brian indicated that this allows the graphs to be read more easily, if there is no data above a certain point, capping the graph allows more space to see the variance. Jessica mentioned that each graph is a discrete instance and that as not all students take each course reviewed the cohorts from one graph to the next are individual groups.

Jessica issued a reminder that beginning in January 2016; we will be meeting on the third Tuesday of each month.

Meeting adjourned at 1:55 pm (Vicki Suehr motioned – Brian seconded)

(Next meeting will be on Tuesday, January 19<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 PM in 2406)