Spring 2022 Meeting

Dates: May 12th-13th, 2022

[**Link to Agenda**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1usou0DHcPsjI5HjCAOFxzBj02o8gA7l8xaLthH1fVyo/edit?usp=sharing)

Thursday, May 12th, 9:00 AM PST

### Welcome and Introductions from RPC President (Kelley Sadler)

* [Kelley shared a useful document that contains everything you need to know about ctcLink :)](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1w_c97r09JAD0mHQzSVqaMrDtW0thrgi_/edit)

### Land Acknowledgement and Beyond (EDI Committee)

RPC members participated in breakout rooms to discuss the presentation shared with us by the EDI committee. No group report out occurred afterwards (due to timing)

### Bias in Research with Summer Kenesson

[Slide deck](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1x2pjjVrlbzWmAfCy1SWwns-S2HSNXOgf/view?usp=sharing)

* Addressing bias will be an important component of the 5227 requirements
* Cultural bias is interpretation based on culturally derived meanings
* Personal bias is interpretation based on personal significance.
  + Both factor into the research process, and it’s important to apply a cross cultural lens at each stage of a research project
* Bias occurs at the following points:
  + research purpose and formulation
  + data collection
  + analysis
  + communication
* Bias and Research Design
  + Confirmation Bias– easy to find what you’re looking for
  + Positivity/Negativity Bias– what comparisons you use impact findings [researching equity gaps usually hit this one, i.e. gaps between white versus other student populations]
  + Narrow focus bias- omission of particular variables in the research process
    - Narrow focus often misses intersectionality (i.e. interaction between variables is also important)
  + Choosing Population and Bias
    - Selection bias – is your population representative of the community you want to study. How does participation barriers impact which students you can recruit
    - Volunteer bias – how do you recruit participants from communities that don’t negatively skew findings. How do incentives influence participation
    - Survivor bias
    - Anchor bias
  + Cultural-fair analysis: interpretation of any cross-cultural study needs to be conducted within the relevant cultural context
    - Research tends to retreat into their domain of expertise for an analysis, which often is removed from the community being studied
  + Analysis bias
    - Selection bias- what is kept/excluded
    - Importance bias- are you focusing on borderline significance or significant but irrelevant, i.e. what factors are you looking based on your scope
    - Range bias- how far are you extrapolating or overgeneralizing your findings
    - Impact bias- are you conflating correlation and causation
  + Benchmark also should be vetted through an anti-bias process
  + Bias minimization strategies include
    - Concept equivalence
    - Content equivalence
    - Linguistic equivalence
    - Technical equivalence
    - Measurement equivalence
  + Very important to test for reading levels in survey instruments, this can introduce substantial barriers depending on population
  + Psychometric tools are also a good option to achieve validity in survey design
  + Bias in Communication
    - Interpretation can unite/divide- and in order to achieve change requires communication
    - Factors include
      * Audience agenda
      * Data comfort level
    - Influence with data
      * Keep it simple
      * Keep it focused, i.e. reflect on the purpose of the initial question
      * Think about framing (for example-99% of those who contracte COVID survived vs 1 million deaths reflects very different messaging
      * Think about messaging, be prepared to engage with how participants will engage with the labels you use
  + Research is a two way street
    - Important to think about how the research impacts you
    - Think about the reception your findings will generate
    - Important to de-personalize feedback

### Update and feedback session with Ami Magisos about Basic Needs Survey

Ami Magioso (WSAC Policy and Planning project manager) solicited feedback from RPC and provided an overview of the Basic Needs Survey

* [Basic Needs Survey Draft](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1bWqbvEEFZyFNZS8MvV1RKi0Yatdh9nDT%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing%26ouid%3D102786115036359363560%26rtpof%3Dtrue%26sd%3Dtrue&data=04%7C01%7Camim%40wsac.wa.gov%7C3223365230a04ce6acd208da014b2a8e%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C637823719615007848%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=bu5CQNwx8AvKo5lskWvSkx3Qn7riPkovE9ILnrih9OM%3D&reserved=0)
* [Basic Needs Proposal](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1AeVuxIHvierfz6aoYlWdYnHRlWC70sKo%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing%26ouid%3D102786115036359363560%26rtpof%3Dtrue%26sd%3Dtrue&data=04%7C01%7Camim%40wsac.wa.gov%7C3223365230a04ce6acd208da014b2a8e%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C637823719615007848%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=LUiqMag3pFRdlyXAuW3nzy86LoDLx5qGaNtsFZvLN1I%3D&reserved=0)
* [Basic Needs Work Group](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1o7Pvm_rXAPxEb1sTUGHqaqvejq9LulY4%2Fedit&data=04%7C01%7Camim%40wsac.wa.gov%7C3223365230a04ce6acd208da014b2a8e%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C637823719615007848%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=n8tFroY5xAvHB287wkWSvdYAKYpD4IEyPddyrqQEVWg%3D&reserved=0)
* Presentation Objectives
  + Increase awareness of the purpose and needs of the survey
  + Receive feedback for implementation
  + Discuss next steps for fall 2022
* Survey Goal
  + Understand disparate impacts of COVID 19
  + Supporting Students experiencing homelessness
  + Drive future investment and policies
* Legislative pilot was funded
  + Partially developed with student ambassador feedback
* Institutions have done this in the past, but this will happen at scale
* Target sample is unclear-Hope Center recommended a population level sample, but it’s not clear what that means
* This survey tries to complement the ongoing work being done by the Hope Center
  + Workgroup partnered with the Hope Center to get to state level data
  + Hope Center told workgroup that next year survey would not go out, so this shouldn’t compete
  + Important to get at state level data
  + Workgroup also wanted control of instrument, and direct access to source data
* Goal is to get regional and state level data to drive large scale change
* No mandate from the legislate to conduct this survey on an annual basis (so it will be done once, next Fall)
* Workgroup engaged in conversations about over-surveying. Workgroup addressed this in a design plan. Their plan was to make it a module institutions could use in a pre-designed survey.
  + Pilot institutions worked through some sampling strategies to address this that will also be shared out
* The workgroup hasn’t engaged with whether or not to survey students under 18. That’s an area where the workgroup wants to collaborate with RPC
* Concern raised about census level data, and the bias that introduces. The workgroup wants to collaborate with RPC post deployment to talk about whether this approach would work better than a random sample
* South Puget Sound
  + Jennifer Tuia reports that SPS did use a census model, and that did lead to some bias (students that needed more aid did respond at higher rates)
  + SPS recommended changing the sampling strategy
  + Fall implementation worked well
* Bellevue
  + Zach Morgan reports that sampling was also a problem
  + The responses are identified to student records, so the only demographic includes what we ask for
* Chat requested an IRB review that would be centralized at the state level
  + Ami responded: We could of how #RealCollege handled IRB implementation
  + Workgroup hasn’t engaged with this one yet
  + Josh Sleppin: select one IRB
  + Kelly: there’s some four year institutions that have IRB’s that we could use
* May–August: WSAC is requesting colleges negotiate participation agreements prior to survey deployment
* September–December: colleges to deploy the survey
* December–January: state level data available for analysis
* Zach [Bellevue]
  + They’re trying to address the workload issues by centralizing aspects of survey administration

### Transgender in the Academy with Stephanie Dykes

[Slide deck available here](https://docs.google.com/presentation/u/1/d/1rDDTFtDDGZ2uSExv_VzqTUc9fHg1m7U-cOUDmVnfKZs/edit)

Purpose: discus transgender issues in terms of how they impact gender diverse higher ed professionals and students

* Legal landscape for transgender Americans
  + Some state legislatures advancing bills that limit transgender rights
  + bathroom bills as prevalent
* DSM approaches transgender as a clinical diagnosis
  + Autonomy issues in terms of individuals identifying as transgender
* Some trans identifying individuals go through medical transition, others don’t
* World Association for Transgender Health is also a good resource for understanding transgender issues
* Distinction between Gender and Sex are important in terms of communicating with the trans-community
* Trans gender communities across multiple cultures and points of history.
  + Different communities at different points of time claim different names in terms of defining the trans community,
* Enumeration at the national level is very limited (so not a lot of national data to work with in terms of understanding the size of trans communities in different parts of the world
  + US Census and IPEDS don’t allow for options other than male or female
* 2015 trans survey of US adults found that respondents reported high level of poverty, sexual violence, and homelessness
* Identity documents are also problematic
  + passports allow a gender option of X, but that doesn’t really align with how the trans community understands gender
  + state level documentation can be very hard to change based on residency, i.e. Washington requirements are very different compared to South Carolina
* Also hard to change name
  + Filling Fees are a barrier
  + Some states require an affidavit of character
  + Requirements vary depending on state
  + Some states (Mississippi) are trying to ban name changes outside of marriage. Written for incarcerated people, but impacts trans community
* Transgender Atheletes also face barriers in collegiate sports
  + NCAA policy mandates limits on testosterone levels
  + Some states are moving to ban trans athletes that change genders
* American Medical Association recommends that exclusionary bathroom policies harm trans identifying individuals
  + The harm to the trans community introduced by bathroom bills has to do with stigmatization
* SBCTC appointed a subcommittee (SOGI) within democon to try and make PeopleSoft more inclusive in terms of gender identities.
  + Hopefully will allow for state level policies and advocacy to improve the trans’ communitiy’s access to higher education
* Allyship is something we all can practice in our work
* Slide deck also includes a link to resources that can be used by trans students.

### NWCCU peer comparison + FTEC Conversation

* Starteboard researcher staff is severely understaffed (7 to 3 people)
* Develop a system solution for data needs; Kelley Sadler and Neal Parker reached out with de-identified data needs from SBCTC
* FTEC Dashboard Options:
  + Detailed college-only
  + Scaled-down public facing dashboard allowing for college-college comparisons
* Comparison groups need to be further reaching than colleges within the state.
* Current dashboards are not what the Commission had in mind, but other colleges had no further pushback on the data available
  + Each assigned reviewer seems to have a different view on data satisfaction
  + Dashboards need to cover basics for indicators that need to be covered for NWCCU (i.e. certificate and degree completions)
* Standards ask for information that colleges do not have access to; particularly for national peers
  + Use IPEDS for national peers
  + Use SBCTC data for state peers - possibly only need to restructure current data dashboard for an easily downloadable data; more easily manipulated
* Every college will need to personalize data to their college for their own Core Themes
* Put dashboard on Research server so that each college has access to their own data
* Possibly ask RPC or college Presidents to write a letter to NWCCU to clarify position on needs to national comparisons; costs every college contract money; seems like colleges could pool resources to get national data for all colleges instead of each one getting it on their own
* FTEC data is available in datalink for individual colleges, but not for peer colleges
* Easiest thing for SBCTC to do is put the entire FTEC dashboard public facing for access
  + Not sure if this is allowable
  + Concern is whether there is a data sharing issue
* Another option is to send data as it currently is, then build a “peer college group” comparison and aggregate the data for peer colleges
* Not going to be a heavy lift, but need to know:
  + what do the colleges need
  + what data is allowed to be shared across colleges; process to figure this out from the SBCTC “data gatekeepers”
  + what format do colleges want the data: dashboard or data set
* Likely okay to work out a data sharing agreement between colleges, if needed
  + Siloed by college; NDAs and data agreements needed for data sharing
* Public dashboards need to be simple; FTEC shouldn’t be public facing because it is such a “powerful tool”
  + Simple limits people what they can look at, but helps them focus on specific data
* Query information to not include individual student data per line, but aggregated by specific information (first-time student); that way there would still be small numbers but not PII to run into FERPA issues
* Thomas Mankovich needs to do some ground work at SBCTC
  + Use data to create aggregate dashboard; system-level
  + Each college can provide their peer colleges and create an aggregate of those predefined peer college groups
  + Logic is there, transcribed to SQL to run
  + Anything is possible within constraints of data sharing
* Need colleges input on needs and then feedback; Kelley Sadler will make the first draft of needs and share out for input
* Zach Morgan will write a SQL code for what he is thinking and pass around the group; will put in RPC sharing
* Bitbucket: Server that hosts some test code; if anyone gets more information on this, please share
* Valerie will take over as Exec as of July 1
* First-Gen is not a disaggregation in FTEC dashboard; will be added since it has been mentioned many times.
* FTEC dashboard ran into issue with students missing from data set
  + Spokane lost about 70 students but did not change outcomes; looking into this concern
  + Information on why this happened will be in the FTEC dashboard notes
* If you have changes at your college, change the contact information in the RPC sheet

### Accreditation Panel

-Anne Marie from Whatcom

-Submitted report early. Reviewed by several people on campus. Easy to coordinate over zoom.

-Gave evaluators a list of who they were going to be meeting with. She prepped these folks for the visit.

-Visit was entirely on zoom. Evaluators were welcoming. Two questions were asked to faculty - “How has student achievement data?” & “How has learning outcome data been used?”

-Advice - keep the report brief and succinct. Would have been nice to have more people review the report. Tell folks that the visit is collegial and to offer responses based on their own experience and that they don’t have to speak for everyone.

-There is a strong culture of using broken out data and that they need to re-build their dashboards.

Zach Morgan from Bellevue

-Report was brief, too. Before visit, he received an excel boilerplate template for what sessions were needed. There were no student sessions like at Whatcom. No formal meeting prior to visit. Communication done over email. Zoom links arrived fairly late for scheduling of final forum.

-Meeting was essentially collegial. Advised folks that the meeting was formative. College was praised for candor and knowledge of where their college needed to grow. How can data be used in resource allocation?

Kristy Anderson Grays Harbor -

-Agreed that visit was collegial.

Ty Jones WVC -

- Visit was not collegial and seemed to go beyond the scope of the purpose of their visit. Evaluators were first time evaluators. Did not ask to visit with students. Exit interview was restricted to senior leadership and that was not typical.

Jennifer Tuia SPSC -

- Evaluators said they didn’t have a community strand in their core themes. That seemed to be out of the scope of their visit.

Raelyn Axlund McBride BTC -

-Year 7 report followed an across constituency approach. Focus was on campus engagement with subject matter experts and weaved into collective campus story.

-Wellness check approach with campus to prep for visit that stressed the importance of accreditation. Did lots of outreach that helped prepare folks to talk about college KPIs. Provided a list of people that would be in each meeting.

-There was a new president during the visit. Some concern over how that would impact the conversation.

-Surprised that one of the evaluators now works in the state at one of the colleges.

-Virtual visit made it tough for the evaluators didn’t get a sense of the campus. Made it hard for the evaluators to read the room to see if folks understood their questions.

-Focus on external benchmarking was intense even though the report was pretty clear about what the college was doing in this area.

-Focus was also primarily on where the college was struggling. Celebration points were missed.

-Used IPEDs as national comparison data. Did not use VFA or PDP. Voiced concerns about PDP.

Samantha Dana Clover Park-

-Confusion about who the evaluators needed to talk to. The excel template was fairly vague. Accreditation steering committee had a lot of turnover. Collaboration process was a little rough. ALO was not present for exit session.

-To give a sense of the campus, walkthrough videos of the campus were played over zoom.

-Evaluators were confused by the table of contents and appendices.

-Faculty were not available on the first day for interviews. Getting students to the student forums was challenging. RSVPs would have been nice to get a headcount of how many students were going to be at the forums.

-Prepping faculty more for what their KPIs and scorecards would have been good.

Nick Velluzi, Wendy Hall, Wilma Dulin as Evaluators

-Meetings over zoom have been more transactional in nature than before the pandemic. They were able to meet with everyone at the college over the course of the visit.

-Says it’s obvious when a college scrambles to put a report together.

-Had a tendency to go into consultant mode or provide advice during the visit but should have stuck to the standards more.

-Keep in mind where the evaluators are coming from as they are not familiar with the Washington ctc system.

-ALO now puts the schedule together before the report is even written.

-Don’t do marathon zoom sessions of 10 hours or more. Especially considering how much additional writing the evaluators will have to do afterwards.

-Evaluators do get to provide additional feedback to commission not included in formal report.

-IR Representative was at every meeting for Wilma’s visit. The role of data is rising and it’s important that broad access is provided. Folks need to know what the scorecards and KPIs are at the college.

**Friday, May 13th**

8:30 AM PST

# SBCTC Updates

[Slide Deck here](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DqhbpfC9C2yFokY97JI7RjM-LOlaU8Dw/view?usp=sharing)

* SBCTC Planning to rehire the following:
  + Director of Policy Research [Not Remote]
  + Research Analyst [Fully Remote]
  + Executive Director [Not Remote]
    - The Executive Director Search is proceeding, there are three finalists, who will be presenting next week
* IPEDS Reporting Challenges
  + Winter/Spring were difficult, but SBCTC attributes this to trying to do dual processing between PeopleSoft and HP
  + SBCTC is actively investigating anomalies with the IPEDs financial aid and running start reporting
* HEERF 2022-23
  + SBCTC investigating the possibility of providing more support to colleges to complete HEERF reporting
* Gainful Employment
  + Currently in negotiated rulemaking, but SBCTC thinks that this will be back
  + SBCTC and Department of Ed working on reducing the reporting burdon
  + No resolution in negotiations around which programs would have to comply with reporting, and which colleges would have to participate
  + Areas of negotiation:
    - wage thresholds by region
    - community impact of low paying careers (EMT, Childcare providers)
    - state student loan levels
* 5227 Campus Climate Assessments
  + If you have findings that you are using, go ahead and submit them. If not, that’s okay. It’s more important to inform SBCTC on where a college is at with the process
  + In 2022-23, SBCTC plans to provide support in terms of:
    - Engagement (sessions and student compensation)
    - Guidelines (what support works best)
* Projects
  + Spring Enrollment Study [Retention and non-participation]
    - SBCTC pushing for focus groups, which will be labor intensive on a variety of levels
    - SBCTC gets this, and will receive some funding from the legislature
  + Transfer and WSAC (Gardner Project)
    - Push to understand student success of two year students at the four year level
    - Math readiness
    - Extraneous credits
  + Guided Pathways WISPP/CCRC
    - Working on scale of adoption assessments
    - Student Outcomes (at the unit record level)
      * Currently no data sharing agreement in place to facilitate this
  + SBCTC Strategic Plan
    - Enrollment Goals
    - Board feels like data does not correlate with the actual goals
  + FTEC Updates
    - Soft launch of applied baccalaureate dashboard

**Friday May 13th 9:30 PST**

RPC Business Meeting

# Roll call

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **College (x = here/present)** | **Spring RPC** |
| Bates Technical College |  |
| Bellevue College | X |
| Bellingham Technical College | X |
| Big Bend Community College | X |
| Cascadia Community College | X |
| Centralia College | X |
| Clark College |  |
| Clover Park Technical College | X |
| Columbia Basin College | X |
| Edmonds Community College | X |
| Everett Community College | X |
| Grays Harbor College | X |
| Green River Community College | X |
| Highline College | X |
| Lake Washington Institute of Technology | X |
| Lower Columbia College | X |
| Olympic College | X |
| Peninsula College | X |
| Pierce (District Office) | X |
| Pierce College | X |
| Renton Technical College | X |
| North Seattle College | X |
| Seattle Central College |  |
| Seattle Colleges (District Office) | X |
| South Seattle College | X |
| Shoreline Community College | X |
| Skagit Valley College | X |
| South Puget Sound Community College | X |
| Spokane (District Office) |  |
| Spokane Community College |  |
| Spokane Falls Community College |  |
| Tacoma Community College | X |
| Walla Walla Community College | X |
| Wenatchee Valley College | X |
| Whatcom Community College | X |
| Yakima Valley Community College |  |

Quorum established per roll call

Winter 2022 minutes approved

**Call For Hosting Colleges**

* RPC will try to host an in-person meeting next fall. Need some colleges to volunteer

# Treasurer's Report

* Starting Balance: 20,208.05
* Stephanie Dykes paid a 500 dollar honorarium
* No to expenses to report

# RPC President’s Report

* There have been a couple of reports from the [Centers of Excellence](https://www.sbctc.edu/for-employers/centers-of-excellence.aspx) (COE), the centers will be continuing to report to WACTC Ed Services. The COE will has a [rubric](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ve0Pb0B5aPMXTE0CU69GLOjritVJLULr/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=107360119861666690538&rtpof=true&sd=true) that they are using to report their progress to WACTC.
* Joe Holiday is retiring at the end of December.
* There was an audit of Financial Aid. One of the recommendations that came back was to request race/ethnicity on the data report that come back from Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC). WSAC has agreed to add the details to the report that comes back to the colleges. There will be a committee from Student Services looking at this data next year
* Instruction council has been working on the legislative funding for CDL and Nursing (and how this funding and programming will be split across the colleges).
* Student Services has been talking about student mental health. There is an expectation that the four colleges that received funding will give presentations in Fall 2022 on their challenges and promising practices.

# WACTC Committee Report Out and Feedback

## WACTC Technology Committee

[Technology Committee](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1gue6_y85_3Rn5rRNTdBXZCh2otTGNSub?usp=sharing)

* WACTC approved of ctclink operational governance model
* New ctclink collaboration group that covers all three pillars
* ITC Guided Pathways survey results discussion

## WACTC Equity Committee

[Equity Committee Report](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1hlEkyGwUlL_6IDA2EyiqE2k5XTqRO0PO/view?usp=sharing)

* Two meetings (March/April)
* Financial aid audit recommendation
  + Look at FAFSA data, recommend including bio-demo data
* Changes to allocation model
  + Ty Holliday provided presentation to the group explaining how the model works
  + Will collaborate with the business office to review the CIP codes and the equity concerns those introduce
* Legislative visit
* 5227 and 5114
* What is the system currently doing
* Hard questions about actionable data

## Data Governance Committee

* How can Ctclink support Guided Pathways
* Ideal fellowship presentations
* Student focus groups are powerful tools to communicate with legislatures
* Key themes that emerged
  + Veterans issues
  + Native students
  + Domestic violence victims
* 22-23 plan is now a 22-24 plan

## Data Governance Advisory Committee

* Pop-up for the data usage and privacy statement is still in development. It won’t launch until all colleges are live and stable. To facilitate the communication on local campuses a data alert will be sent out. The communication via a data alert will have the following components: a description of the process and why it’s necessary, the opportunity to encourage institutional training to staff, identify if the agreement is by-passed, and communicating the query and table information for local security administrator knowledge. The data alert will be sent after DGC has passed the DPA user acceptance training.
* Demographic feedback for the data alert regarding the two processes for handling race (insert a large number of race codes up front and using the decision framework for inclusion or removing race codes). There has been a few comments but those have not been brought back to DGC yet (DGC meets next week). Thanks to RPC for providing any comments. It was a heavy lift for the democomm committee to complete this project. The RPC democomm members will probably add to this item of my report.
* Upcoming:
* Course numbers are designated by policy. Course numbering for continuing education do not necessarily follow this policy and are inconsistent. In the new CtcLink integrated system, this vagueness is starting to cause data quality problem. To be clear, this is a course number identification and NOT COMMON COURSE NUMBERING. This is just a discussion at this point. The CE Council governing group will play a significant role in any discussions and/or policy changes. The first step is to write up a problem statement.
* Dummy Classes - Are they necessary? These were created as a work around in Legacy but now in ctcLink, those work arounds are no longer necessary in many/most instances. Dummy classes that have been created were created because ‘that’s how it’s always been done’. Are there instances where a dummy class is valid? If there is a need, then there should be a standardized method for creating them. Need feedback from the system to identify a true need for dummy classes (forthcoming request).

## Strategic Technology Advisory Committee

* Working on new governance model
* Work through Wendy Hall and Joe Duggan to make system recommendations
* Steering Committee has gone away
* All colleges still experiencing implementation challenges
* STAC will be the driver for enhancement requests for Ctclink

## Information Technology Commission (ITC)

* Discussion about supporting hybrid work environments
* Discussion about ongoing hiring challenges
* How to integrate DEI into ITC
* Budget Reduction Strategies
  + Underutilized services
  + Reducing duplicative applications

## Query Governance Committee/ctcLink Reporting Leads

* No report at this time

## Baccalaureate Leadership Council

* Earning outcomes for BAS graduates
* How do student populations compare (Applied Associate degrees versus BAS degrees)
* Do BAS degrees help the state achieve it’s stated goals for bachelor degree attainment
* Commonalities and differences for general education offerings
* What general education curriculum is necessary for a student to earn a BAS degree

## Data Governance Demographic Subcommittee (DemoCom)

* Race/Ethnicity expansion project moved to the data governance committee
* Discussion about MENA students
  + Request to fully separate out MENA categories from white
  + This request did not move forward. MENA categories will continue to be aggregated under white in the front end of PeopleSoft
* Committee discovered that in some instances self service defaults employees to white
* Perkins data collection
  + Working with Carmen Mckenzie to figure out what other options are available compared to student self serv
* Pronoun data collection
* Integration between CS and HCM pillars, why the data does or doesn’t crosswalk
* DEMOCON membership discussions (RPC is half the membership at this point)

## Extra Business

* Wendy Hall serving on a task force to revive WELA

# RPC Committee Report Outs and Feedback

## ctcLink

* The ctcLink Committee became a Data Warehouse committee. We have been meeting monthly with Carmen McKenzie from Data Services.
* Guiding Principles:
  + Use ctcLink fields when directly sourced from ctcLink and will use friendly names when the field is derived. (Noted is that legacy data and expertise will diminish over time, so keeping with ctcLink when possible)
* We are hoping for 3 to 5 years of data in the new data warehouse. The old data warehouse will stand, so SBCTC and colleges will continue to have their prior data.
* We would like having STRM as a primary key.  But we would like to add an ACADEMIC\_YEAR like 2021-22
* Do not need to retain the DW\_Key.  We are good with going with EMPLID (as long as the EMPLID is unique per student)
* We leave with a little homework on looking at the data fields in ISIR tables that we need for grants, etc. (Not pulling all data in the data warehouse just because we have it, but having a business need)
* There seems to be a little difference of opinion between SBCTC data services and SBCTC researchers on the best way forward with the next data warehouse. After some discussion we agreed to a 2 pronged approach where
* There are clear needs for colleges that have been waiting up to 7 years for a DW with ctcLink.  There have been several grants where the colleges are working together and not able to pull that data through the warehouse if the college was on ctcLink.  The work we are currently doing seems to lend itself to a product (data mart) more quickly.
* There will likely be a second group that works to gather research on other colleges that have PeopleSoft what they are using for a Data Warehouse.  This committee would need to have a list of research questions to start to ask these colleges.  (Do you have a data warehouse? What tools are you using for that data warehouse? Did you use consultants for the data warehouse? How easy to upgrade the data warehouse?  Are you happy with your data warehouse, tools, and consultants? What have you learned? What would you recommend to us as we are looking at updating our data warehouse?)

## Accreditation

[**Google Drive Link**](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oDeThsYDI04Ypm9z3R43e-7c0rnK9GM0?usp=sharing)**:**

* No report out provided

## Equity Diversity Inclusion Committee

[**Google Drive Link**](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1IH5GnL4vi3dy2j1Q4m6pSM6dd04hLaYc?usp=sharing)

* EDI plans to keep the google drive updated as new content is created
  + Developing an EDI resource bank which is in the google drive folder
  + Colleges should update their information
* Discussion of [EDI report](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1eOWeXbR3raAV32QJqjdg3XytuWAK9-Dn/edit#slide=id.p4):
* Reach out of the EDI as your college encounters issues
* Work completed on RPC norms
  + Feedback was very positive, and the norms seem to be successful
* Discussion about the usage of the term grace and whether or not it was appropriate (i.e. grace’s link to Christainity

## Research Ethics

[**IRB/resources inventory**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1wUpU1PKn6nJPF7lYVKd6W-EKAAmGfOmP/edit?pli=1#gid=1235785965)

[**Campus Research listserv**](https://lists.ctc.edu/mailman/listinfo/campus-research_lists.ctc.edu)

* Attendance issues are a substantial problem
* Moving to an annual meeting (once a year at RPC) instead of every meeting
* Building out IRB inventory
* Professional development opportunity discussion
* Not an official committee due to avoiding administrative burden with ed services

# Unfinished Business

* Nothing Reported

# New Business

## Elections Committee

* Jason Engels: elected as President Elect
* Emily Coates: elected as Treasurer

## Other Business

* Exec will announce new schedule after meeting with WACTC provides their schedule
* Please fill out feedback survey

Neal mentioned to close the meeting

Wendy Seconded

# Meeting Adjourned