



VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION CENTER

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUNE 9, 2017

8:30 AM – 9:30 PM ➤ DAC LAKIN BOARDROOM

MEETING NOTES

Attendance: Cynthia Herrera, Janet Dawald, Lisa Hopper, Lisa Branton, Lisa Hopper, Lisa Putnam, Mike Rose, Nan Duangpun, Pamela Yeagley, Phillip Briggs, Roccio Cervantes, Sunny Le

Guest: Alexandria Wright, Holly Correa

1. Review Meeting Notes of 05/12/17
The notes were approved.
2. VC Innovates (Holly Correa)
Holly shared her spreadsheet, explaining the information that is needed to be tracked for the VC Innovates students. John has been working with Holly on this project. They noted that the information is entered into Katema (high school database) and they might need to be contacted in order to delve deeper into the needed data. The deadline is August 31, however, since this is new for all organizations, the California Department of Education is being flexible. Holly specified that she wanted to learn from the group and requested any ideas and suggestions. The group discussed the issue at length including how students enrolled in internships are tracked at the three colleges. Consistency amongst the three campuses was thought to be key, with a central person to manage the data. Lisa Putnam mentioned that a research analyst position is being developed, hopefully to be presented to the Board next month for approval, and would be a centralized position out of MC.
3. Institutional Effectiveness Report to Board Planning Session on July 26th
Cynthia needs the data from MC and VC to add to the report. The group discussed that the IE report is an internal report and the Scorecard is required by the state. Concern of an overlap of information between the two reports was expressed as well as possible confusion when presented to the Board. The group discussed changing the structure of the presentation to the Board in order to better explain the difference between the two reports. Lisa Putnam and Cynthia Herrera plan to collaborate on details to reshape the presentation. The IEPI report also needs to be considered since the information also overlaps. The group agreed that Rick's input was needed.
4. Student Success Scorecard
The college Presidents are given the main bullet points and prepped on the Scorecard information for the presentation to the Board. The group discussed that

the Scorecard shows the previous six years of data, which can be confusing since newer programs are not reflected. (See Item 6 for related discussion.)

5. Employee Perception Survey Update

Pam noted that per a DCAP meeting, HR has signed off on the questions and that the survey has been approved to be deployed. She suggested that Rick be consulted for verification. The group discussed different tools to use for deployment of the survey, citing Class Climate and Survey Monkey. Mike shared that software from Qualtrics is being reviewed and the analytics are thought to be better than Survey Monkey. The group expressed interest in a demonstration of the product.

6. Student Perceptions Survey Revisions – continued

Lisa Branton shared a handout that detailed the reasoning behind her proposed changes to the survey. The number of questions was reduced from forty-eight to twenty-four. Discussion ensued. The survey will not be administered until at least spring of 2018 which allows for continued discussion and evaluation of the survey.

7. Data Dictionary (Lisa Branton)

Lisa Branton suggested that it would be helpful to develop a data dictionary to explain the meaning of the different data tables. She has discussed with Lisa Putnam and offered for MC to take the lead with one person from each campus involved and one person from IT. The group discussed and agreed this would be helpful. One suggestion was to devote thirty minutes at the end of the IRAC meetings to this task. Discussion on how to proceed will continue at the next meeting.

8. Other Business

- In relation to budgeting, Lisa Hopper mentioned the \$150.00 increase in annual dues for RP (Research and Planning Group). She also noted that there is a \$2,000.00 increase for SRTK (Student Right To Know). She questioned if the colleges need to budget for the increases. She thought that SRTK might go through the District office. John verified that SRTK does go through Business Services at the District office and he will verify how it is budgeted.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for July 14.