**IE&A Goal #3 Update:**

Task force meeting participants: Kevin Kawa, Kim Smith, Christina Gheorghe, Jason Sim, Maria Aguilar Beltran

Goal #3: More intentional use of research by SEAP committee to better inform committee role/vision/mission.

Activities with Task Force oversight include:

1. Identification of data needs for SEAP committee
2. Creation of dashboard for identification of DI students
3. Creation of data coaching classes for PD
4. Creating of training on methods of measuring disproportionate impact (PD)

We were asked to provide:

1. The number of faculty, staff, administrators participating in data coaching on use of Power BI
2. The number of faculty, staff, administrators participating in DI measuring training
3. The number of program reviews utilizing Power BI data.

And to compare the status of SAC progress on SEAP goals to stated goals.

**Spring Outcome report:** Dashboards and training materials were created around course outcomes, N.E.A.T., and a disproportionate impact calculator. Future build out includes a dashboard geared specifically towards program review based on the most common data points requested. Identification of data specific to DI students. These dashboards can be found at <https://www.sac.edu/research/Pages/Dashboard-Research-Pages.aspx>. There are training videos associated with each dashboard. There is also a Career Education Course Outcomes Dashboard and training video. A Disproportionate Impact Calculator and associated training video are located on the Research Department webpage at <https://www.sac.edu/research/Pages/Dashboard-Research-Pages.aspx>. Also included is a article by Giovanni Sosa for deep diving.

Checking with Professional Development, we were able to ascertain that 9 staff participated in Power BI training during professional development week for Spring 2022. At the same time the tool to measure disproportional impact was also introduced. Presumably this number is a bit low as the Research Department will show up nearly anywhere to demonstrate these tools since then. With regard to the number of program reviews that are utilizing Power BI data, there were 21 programs (academic and student services) scheduled for program review during this academic year. These groups would have had different levels of access to Power BI since those tools were rolled out after the transition. A number of sources could be identified in the reports, including surveys and a number of dashboard sources at the state, district, and local level.

During our March 3, 2022 meeting, task force members discussed some additional topics. Perhaps they will lead to additional goals or conversations that incorporate into the Allocation and Planning Subcommittee.

* There is systemwide debate on how to measure DI. (Who is DI? The answer can depend on how the data is compared. Proportionality Index, PPG-1, 80%, etc. ) There are plans to consult with other colleges on how they resolved this data dilemma?
* Traditionally the Research Department has provided a yearly report. Should there be a shift towards connecting data to the Vision for Success Plan.
* How can faculty best use data and outcomes to make plans? How do you “retreat” into that?
* How do we help faculty make sense of data? MAB suggested we use an inquiry, strength based, process that is grounded in theory in order to analyze data. Apparently there are inquiry frameworks that can be used. Can we find something? The resulting process needs to making racial data specifically visible, she suggests. Ultimately, however, we must all look at ourselves. What are we doing systematically?
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