



VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION CENTER

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 13, 2017

8:30 AM – 9:30 PM ➤ DAC SANTA ROSA ROOM (209)

MEETING NOTES

Attendance: Carol Higashida, Cynthia Herrera, Damien Hoffman, Dave Fuhrmann, Hala Sun, John Cooney, Kevin Carlson, Kim Watters, Lisa Hopper, Lisa Branton, Mike Rose, Nan Duangpun, Pamela Yeagley, Phillip Briggs, Sunny Le
Guest: Eric McDonald

1. Review Meeting Notes of 09/08/17
Pamela had sent a change to the notes prior to the meeting for item 4, replacing “Pam has created a glossary in the past that she has shared; she will resend to the group.” with “Pamela resent the group the *Ventura County Community College District Glossary for the Program Planning Data Report* dated October 2001.”
2. Faculty Evaluations / Qualtrics Update
Mike expressed interest in determining if Qualtrics would resolve some of the problems with the faculty evaluations. He requested some guidance as to which campus staff should be involved with reviewing the faculty evaluation components. The group discussed the past and current processes. Dave noted that although HR staff have not been engaged in the process for some time, HR had ownership in the past. He will have a conversation with the Vice Chancellor of HR, Michael Shanahan. Phil inquired if others were being consulted; Dave agreed that this should go through a vetting process with the Academic Senates and HR. Cynthia inquired if it was confirmed that Qualtrics will be purchased to replace Survey Monkey; Dave can present to DOC at their next meeting. The cost is \$4,500 for the basic package. There is an integration tool with Tableau that the group wanted which will be an extra cost.
3. Student Success Scorecard – Template Review
Dave shared that the Chancellor’s Cabinet approved the November 14th Board meeting for the scorecard presentation. The deadline is November 6. The format will remain the same as in past years.
4. IRB (Institutional Review Board) Discussion
Cynthia explained that an Institutional Review Board needs to be in place in order for community colleges to publish research papers and journals. Hala mentioned that for research conducting purposes, there may be an exemption if the human subjects are not identified. Phil added that when publishing APA journals in his field, it needs to be submitted to the IRB in order to obtain an exemption. The group discussed building an IRB process in order to protect student anonymity and for the ability to publish. Another benefit would be ethics awareness and training

for collecting data for projects. The benefits of a district-wide IRB versus individual college IRBs was discussed. Dave noted that the DAC does not currently have a manager to oversee the IRB and suggested a Vice President from one of the colleges. The group decided to recommend that a district-wide IRB, comprised of individuals from each location, be formed. Dave invited Phil, Pamela, and Hala to speak on the subject at Chancellor's Cabinet. Hala will draft a paragraph for the Cabinet meeting and submit to the group for review before the meeting.

5. Other Business

- The group discussed the committee membership as described in the Participatory Governance Decision-Making Handbook. It was decided to recommend two changes: 1) remove the stipulation of '(up to 3)' college institutional research staff and 2) change the current wording for the Co-Chair: College Institutional Researcher or Manager, as there is only one staff with that title. Dave will propose these changes to the Chancellor's Cabinet and request clarification of DCAP's role with IRAC. Dave requested the group review the full committee charge and send any other suggested changes to him.
- The group nominated and elected Philip Briggs (VC) as co-chair. The last two co-chairs were from MC and OC and the committee wanted to rotate between the locations.
- Mike shared an informational item for those who attended the Argos training. A new version was rolled out on Thursday. Argos use has been monitored over the last month and a targeted email will be sent to those users informing them of the update.
- Eric gave a recap of the dual enrollment changes for high school students related to AB 288. A permit process registration will replace the manual registration method where high school students are flagged as on hold. This change will be implemented beginning Monday with the upgrade. The new procedure has three phases. The first is the normal high school registration which will require a permit override to register. The second phase is the waiver of the health and other student fees. Per AB 288, when a course is taught in high school during normal high school hours fees cannot be charged. Courses designated as a CCAP course will not have any fees. Reporting to the state is also a part of the second phase. Phase three will involve changes to allow better efficiency for the documentation and paper work for the approval process. One significant change is that students will no longer be forced into a high school curriculum. John suggested that now would be the time to start discussing terminology and Eric shared that there have been discussions with the Registrars. Cynthia mentioned that there is a need to distinguish between the regular dual enrollment students and those dual enrollment students in CCAP. The group discussed how to handle for reporting purposes. It was decided that when a new application is received from a student, all existing attributes will be terminated.
- Lisa Branton requested the status of the Promesas grant with CSUCI. Dave hasn't been contacted and no one was aware of any forward movement.

- Cynthia brought up multiple measures codes and that there is a need to identify students who utilize the assessment. There isn't one single code for multiple measures and the level that the student places in after taking the assessment. John suggested a Banner form. Mike explained that this is in constant motion and that the campuses all handle assessment differently. The processes are in flux at the moment and he suggested tabling this until there is some settling. This is 3SP reportable so there is an existing code and Mike suggested maybe some analysis could be done in that direction. Cynthia explained that this is time sensitive and wants the discussion to stay on the table. It needs to be determined where the student places and if they take the course. Results are being skewed. The group discussed and agreed to continue the discussion in the future.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10.