Welcome and Introductions
Mary Cantrell asked that all members introduce themselves again for the sake of the new members. Mary welcomed all members and thanked all members for serving on the committee.

Meeting minutes from September 22 were approved.

Sean shared that we have some survey data (e.g., PACE, CCSSE, as well as the recent Quality Initiative survey for HLC question regarding the most important thing the College should be doing right now) that will help develop some themes with which we can move forward. He also mentioned that we will be looking at how to reach out to solicit input.

Review Environmental Scan
Kevin reviewed the environmental scan slides that were prepared by the Planning and Institutional Research department. This is a look at internal and external factors that affect the College. Kevin will send the slides to the committee members.

Survey data will be available on October 17. Surveys were sent to employees, students, and community members. Marketing sent to 2,800 community members. Kevin pulled 3,500 community members’ email addresses, gathered from other internal resources such as Continuing Education, Recruitment, EXCELebrate, and the Higher Ed Forum. Surveys close next Friday, October 10, and the following week we will discuss the findings that P&IR will compile. Survey results will be shared with Arnie Bacigalupo to help inform him for the focus groups.

Notable highlights from environmental scan data:
- The available map of TCC/TJC’s service area is outdated.
- Wagoner County’s population increased by about 27% from 2000 to 2010.
- Unemployment decreased which resulted in decreases in enrollment.
- Spring 2012 High School Graduates: About half of Tulsa County students who attended an OK college in Fall 2012 came to TCC; rate for other four counties in service area are fairly low.
- Applicant tracking: Not all applicants actually enroll. One reason for this is incomplete applications but there are other red flags, per Michael Harris and Nicole Mina.
- Probably that the economic recession produced an artificial boost in enrollment around 2009-2010.
• Online courses have shown increased enrollment despite declines in overall enrollment.
• First-time entering definition: a student coming in to TCC for the first time with six or fewer attempted credit hours. Concurrent hours are not counted and concurrent students are not considered first-time.
• Tulsa Achieves cohort numbers have been fairly stable since Fall 2007.
• Concurrent high school students boomed in Spring 2011 with EXCELerate and continues to rise. Fall 2009 K-12 passed dual enrollment.
• Minority enrollment as a percent of total enrollments numbers has increased, even over the past few years. Population and demographic shifts affected that and it is expected to continue to rise.
• Average student age is about 27-28 years old over the past three years. Age 25 and older student enrollments dropped a bit in the past year, possibly due to increases in job availability.
• Number of first-time degree/certificate-seeking students who place into at least one developmental area is over 70 percent and about 50% place into at least two. Math is the area placed into most.
• Unduplicated Enrollment by Status: We are losing full-time students, possibly due to an improving economy.
• 3-year Graduation rates are based on first-time, degree/certificate-seeking, full-time students who graduate with any credential. Unofficial for Fall 2011 cohort is 13%, down from 14%, and may just reflect random fluctuation. It is important to focus on getting students graduated.
• Department of Education treats the race/ethnicity differently than we do. Confusing reporting. Anyone listed as Hispanic also selected something else for race.
• 3-year Graduation rates for Developmental Ed students are less than 10%.
• Complete College America: TCC’s goal is to add 71 graduates every year to reach the 2023 goal. This would be a good performance indicator. TCC’s projections are from actual numbers for 2014.
• Transfers: Merging data from National Student Clearing House and UDs. This data is from OSRHE and includes any TCC student transferring to any other university.
• CCSSE assesses student engagement, not satisfaction, and we will be doing this survey again in spring (every other year). CCSSE compares TCC with other institutions. Student say their primary goal is to get Associates degree and move on. 77% of the student work for pay. 55% of the students care for dependents.
• CCSSE Benchmarks: our students’ means are below the median on each benchmark. This could also be a performance indicator. TCC will also be doing CCFSSE in Spring. Comparing TCC to earlier CCSSE Survey, TCC did not change since 2009.
• Aspects of higher engagement (things we are above average) and Aspects of lowest student engagement (room for growth)
• Alumni Survey Results (every year, six-months after graduating): At this time we do not have a good way to track students after graduation.
• PACE Survey is done every three years, TCC will be doing this survey this year. We may have some of the survey results back before Strategic Plan is launched. Satisfaction is
higher in 2012 than in 2008. Comparison of norm base shows that we are higher than other institutions. Reviewed top 10 and bottom 10 items.

Mary commented that 2008 has many of the same items on it and could provide some insight. Kevin reminded everyone that the Planning and Institutional Research website has this and other historic information. Discussion followed regarding if and how we use or could use the feedback from these surveys to improve the College. An important aspect of strategic planning is to determine and define key performance indicators and measure and assess outcomes. The entire college will be involved with implementing the Strategic Plan.

Mike Render (local researcher) does a periodic benchmarking study for Lauren Brookey that includes interviews with current students, high school students, and the general public regarding perceptions of TCC. The results of the current study should be ready in Fall 2014.

Margaret Lee, Dean of Developmental Education, has been leading a developmental redesign project. The HLC Quality Initiative for TCC will focus on developmental education. Several will be attending a workshop next week.

**Surveys, Focus Groups, and Other Ways to Solicit Input**

Regent Robin Flint Ballenger is coming to our meeting on October 30. Regents Paul Cornell and Bill McKamey will be coming to our meeting on November 17.

Focus groups will meet on two days in October (10/20-21). Kevin reviewed the list of focus groups. There are two questions to discuss and decide:

1. What type of questions do we want to ask these focus group participants?
2. What other ways do we want to engage and gather information?

The role of our consultant, Dr. Arnold Bacigalupo, is an organization development consultant and a former Loyola faculty member. He facilitates group discussion and it was thought that an outside person would be better to gather more candid responses. Discussion followed about what are we trying to obtain from these groups. We want to ascertain from the groups what their sense of priorities are and what key areas might be missing.

Sean asked for discussion about what type of information might be valuable to obtain from the groups. Groups will have a packet that contains our mission, vision, and core values. Kevin stated that the focus groups are more in-depth than the survey. The survey results will be available for Arnie to use for the survey and may reveal some of the themes. Heather asked how we make sure the answers are more than anecdotal and can help us compare to actual data. Kevin replied that biases are always present when asking opinions and that the focus groups are a small sample which is why we are using several methods to solicit information and look for themes that show up across all the methods.

Heather has been asked about what other opportunities employees will have to participate. Reply: College-wide engagement is when we have subcommittees and action teams. We will have some themes from the results of the first survey and the focus groups and take those
themes to other groups throughout the College and “over-communicate” and “over-ask”. Everyone has had an opportunity in the survey that was sent out. We will need to talk with people in person. Cindy suggested that people might want to help prioritize which themes to focus on and which performance indicators to use to move the needle.

Survey response rates so far: 500 responses from students; 91 employees; 86 from the community

Sean offered that last time we worked on the Strategic Plan there were multiple meetings at SEC chat room. We could present some themes gathered so far and ask what they like; everyone gets three votes. Then ask what themes we missed.

In order to engage with employees in a way that works for each campus, we’ll have a team that goes out to various groups. We’ll communicate the steps along the way so people can help coordinate the efforts. Each member of the committee should present to their own group.

Another suggestion that was offered is an online component for people to rank themes or participate in discussion.

Sean asked about the committee’s thoughts on big group meetings. The internal steering committee of only 4 or 5 from last time had meetings with a lot of people. Those large meetings mattered because that’s what people remember. Could it be they remember because that’s all that was done?

Suggestions included:
It should be a selective invitation with the message that “you’re on this team because you’re from this group” rather than an open invitation that just asks people to show-up. They will remember that they had a role in it.

Ideally, data should be presented and the big picture shared, then ask what they think.

A subcommittee to develop either the groups or the methods for interacting was recommended and further discussion resulted in the following subcommittee:

Cindy Hess, Kari Culp, and Mary Cantrell. Greg Stone and Chelsey Gipson will be asked to serve on that subcommittee as well. Kevin David will go to meetings, as needed and requested. The charge will be inclusion and content, which is to prioritize themes and any gaps that might have been missed, as well as to make connections between themes and data.

Michael suggested that there be some way for people to see what’s going on comprehensively such as a summary (perhaps one page of bullet points) of activities supporting the Strategic Plan that we could share with focus groups to provide context. Kevin will create one page document with some bullet points from the environmental scan data.

Kevin will send the Environmental Scan slides to committee members. All members are to look at them and highlight their ideas.
Adjourned: 4:52 pm

**Action Items:**

- Kevin will find out if transfer data includes concurrent students.
- Kevin will create a one-page document with some bullet points from environmental scan data.
- Kevin will email the Environmental Scan Slides to committee members.
- Committee members will decide which statistics from the Environmental Scan should be shared with focus group attendees. Email Kevin by Friday, October 10.

*Respectfully submitted by Terry JacobsDavis*