MCCDEC

Michigan Community College Data and Evaluation Committee

Minutes
Friday, March 23, 2007
Henry Center, Lansing, MI

Attendees: Beverly Andrews, Linda Blakey, Steve Cannell, Becky Chadwick, Heath Chelesing, Ginger Gulick, Gail Ives, Samantha Cameron, Chet Kasper, Leslie Kellogg, Kathy Marsh, Robert Marsh, Linda Minter, Jim Ross, Denise Sigworth, Bernadette Spencer, Gerald Svendor, George Xia

Ex-officio: Ron Harkness, James Folkening, Rhonda Burke, Dan Woodward

Meeting called to order at 9:05 am by Chair, Linda Blakey. Introductions were made around the table. Presented today's agenda.

Motion made by Denise Sigworth to accept to agenda. Second by Gail Ives. Motion passed.

Reviewed minutes from September 22, 2006 meeting. Motion to accept made by Becky Chadwick. Second by Leslie Kellogg. Motion passed.

State and Federal Updates – Ron Harkness

- Ron indicated that Robin Sutfin is retiring after more than 30 years with the State.
- Jim reported on new Director of Career Development, Dr. Keith Cooley, and new Deputy Director of DLEG, Andy Levin.
- All positions are frozen in terms of hiring for vacancies.

Federal Data Collection – this agenda item skipped per Jim Folkening

Review Proposal for New Core Indicators

At last MCCDEC meeting we went over the core indicators. We recently received a Letter of Guidance on the core indicators from the US Department of Education.

We will be using 2005-06 data as the baseline year for establishing our benchmark for the ensuring years. We will need to redo the 2005-06 data using the new guidelines so we have something to compare our 2006-07 data. This fall we will be running the 2005-06 data based on the "old indicators". The 2006-07 year will be for refining the definitions.

Possibility that no indicators will need to be reported to the Feds until the 2008-09 year; because 2007-08 is considered the transition year. Important for us to collect the 2006-07 data so we have a better idea if our benchmark values are valid. The Feds will be renegotiating the benchmarks every 2 years.

We will use students in all occupational programs not just state approved occupational programs.
Confusion about the phrase 'within a single program area sequence' – will we have to track specific course sequences?
Question if schools are looking at 'trigger' courses to determine if student is in a program.
Jim raised the question about what 'recognized credential' means? Is it expanding beyond our board approved degrees and certificates?

Denise cautioned about developing programs of less than 16 credits because of the Federal financial aid limitations.

1P1 – Technical Skill Attainment
CTE concentrators who passed technical skill assessments aligned with industry-recognized standards. Currently, the State of Michigan does not have state wide technical skill assessments. Denise indicated that K-12 has an initiative to assess technical skills that the secondary students are attaining.

Currently it is very difficult to obtain scores for students taking board exams, i.e., nursing.

We may want to recommend that we use minimum grades earned in technical courses to measure this indicator.

Dan feels that many programs across the State are already using industry-recognized assessments in their programs. Programs with advisory committees are already using some of those exams in measuring their progress. Dan made recommendation that we bring instructors together from various schools to develop and agree on tests.

Gerry indicated that his school is using the NACHI exam for their criminal justice program. Can't we use this test for other areas as well?

Higher Learning Commission is already requiring outcomes and assessments for all programs. So this would be alignment of the assessment of skills.

Gail made motion for a work group to be established to develop state level assessment tools. A big curriculum issue, faculty would need to be included to get their buy-in.

2P1 – Credential, Certificate, or Diploma
Heath previously worked in the Oklahoma system. Oklahoma is a state system that had developed state level career and technical testing. Instructors in each of the discipline areas developed tests. The testing was delivered to the students via an on-line system.

Question on the denominator. Why is it the number of CTE concentrators who left postsecondary education? Now is more of a ratio than a rate.

Dan restated – of all the students who left the institution, how many received a degree or certificate. Many of us are uncomfortable with only reporting on the students who left.

Question – are dual enrolled students included as post-secondary students for the core indicators?

3P1 – Student Retention or Transfer
(Reiterate the definitions)

4P1 – Student Placement
Becky had concerns about some of these definitions. Need further clarification before we can move forward finalizing the definitions.
Rhonda stated that we could clarify CTE concentrators who left postsecondary as those who graduated.
Denise asked about UI wage data.
Steve had question about timing of the follow-up survey.
Denise recommended looking at WIA data and what they require for reporting.

Concern about vague definitions and whether that increases the inconsistency of the measurements between schools. Ron brought up issue of sanctions. Based on the results some schools may receive sanctions based on their results.

Should this definition be cohort based?

5P1 – Nontraditional Participation
This is CTE participant and not concentrator. The eligible programs will be determined by the state. There are some programs that have changed with the new authorization.

This measure will be based on the program enrollments that we submit. Rhonda runs all the non-traditional data for all the institutions.

5P2 – Nontraditional Completion
This is CTE concentrator and not CTE participant as in 5P1.

Workgroups & Issues – Jim Folkening
During the Dean's In-service discussion of workgroups in the following 3 areas:

Program of Study – what do we mean by high demand or high wage programs? Evaluate how programs become eligible for Perkins funding? Will there be further refinements in the future? Also clarify sanctions that may come about because of Perkins funding. Look at existing policy areas in the Deans guide and refining as needed.
Gail asked about timelines for responses from these committees. Items for the State plan needed by early fall. An example might be required NATEF certification, but some schools may not have NATEF certification in their programs. Evaluate if program assessments are available. Look at another distribution model for Perkins funds that is not based on total occupational hours.

Special Populations Services – how do we get special pop students into high demand, high wage programs?
Need more information on how to do the process, i.e.,
Implementation of Core Indicators –
Determine criteria for continuous improvement
Determine sanction criteria
Look at information provided by pilot schools on the new indicators
Sanctions may cause schools to return money they have already received
Now have latitude to have 90% of the indicator and be OK

Steve noted that we must be much better in defining the obscure definitions provided by the Feds before we have any sanctions.

State staff will rewrite the definitions so that it makes sense to the staff that run (calculate) the actual data.

Denise and Becky indicated that more time needs to be spent figuring out exactly what we need to pull for the measurements.

State staff will clarify the definitions and have people react to the new definitions.

Bev wanted to know if we have a sense of future funding for Perkins? Seems like we are having to do more and more work and getting less and less money.

There was discussion of how to get rid of some of our required reports. It is important for Presidents to push through MCCA to lobby to get rid of reports.

Jim indicated that the Feds expect states to work with multiple states to develop certification exams.

Jim talked about importance of aligning the programs with K-12. Denise asked if we were considering funding based on the type of program, i.e., schools would get more money for students in particular programs – i.e., health.

Leslie asked about Tech Prep reporting. The data will not be collected by Rhonda but will need to be reported to the Tech Prep Consortia. The funded source is responsible for gathering the data.

Sent sign-up sheet for MCCDEC members to sign up for Workgroups.

Next Meeting – Friday, June 15, 2007.

Motion by Denise Sigworth to adjourn meeting. Second by Steve Cannell. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.