MINUTES
Thursday, May 8, 2014
3:00 pm-5:00 pm
SSB-414

The meeting was called to order at 3:11 pm

Introductory Remarks
R. Tillberg began the meeting reviewing the purpose of the meeting. This meeting is one of two annual meetings where PIE meets jointly with the Budget Committee. The March meeting this year was to evaluate process, and the current meeting is to evaluate effectiveness, specifically, to forward the institution’s work toward accreditation standard III.D.3:

“The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement”

Minutes and Recommendations of March 6 Joint Meeting
The group reviewed the minutes and recommendations from the March 6th Joint meeting. Some members asked if recommendations that needed further work to be on the agenda for the current meeting. R. Tillberg noted in response that action on the recommendations would require ongoing work. In addition, she and others clarified that the previous meeting was to evaluate process while this meeting was to evaluate effective use of resources. In order to keep the discussion and recommendations fresh in the committee’s minds, the attendees decided to approve the minutes in each of the Budget and PIE meetings. The minutes and recommendations will therefore be sent by email with changes worked out over email to be approved in the next subsequent Budget and PIE meetings.

Review of Draft Process for Meeting Basic Supply Needs
One recommendation from the March Joint meeting was a draft of a process to re-establish budget for meeting basic supply needs. R. Tillberg proposed that the group approve and forward the draft process. Following some discussion about some changes in the text (e.g. the chronology of the initial cuts; making clear that the change to “zero-out” supply budgets remains current practice), the draft policy was approved to forward to College Council.

Evaluation Data
R. Tillberg introduced the data presentation noting that the data would presented from a bird’s-eye view. In addition, our accrediting agency is encouraging institutions to take a holistic view of the institution.

Financial Resources and FTES
Referencing the “Expenditure, Ending Balance, FTES” table, K. Takeda highlighted that with Proposition 30, our estimated revenues (indicated by expenditure in the table) resemble 2008-09 levels. He observed that while some thought Proposition 30 would solve our financial problems, in reality it just prevented us from retreating further. He added that as long as the tax
provisions in the proposition pan out, the outlook for West and community colleges in general is positive.

He also noted that our recent trend in FTES, including the projected 2014 FTES, falls well below the high point of 2008/09, so our enrollment has not recovered and may not recover next year. He mentioned that the district assumed 3% enrollment growth based on the governor’s budget, but this may be adjusted downward.

One attendee asked a series of clarifying questions about the about the elements in the table and chart being displayed. To the first question, about the relationship between expenditure and FTES generated, K. Takeda noted that while there’s not direct correlation, when what’s called workload (FTES that the state will pay us for) goes up, our revenues from general apportionment go up, and as that goes up we hire more instructors, often adjuncts, and so labor costs increase.

Asked about the year 08/09, K. Takeda explained that what he heard happen was that we had planned for higher workload from the state, so we added classes, but midyear there was a cut from the state, so for colleges that were overscheduled when the state pulled back the funding, the colleges were left with those costs. Other attendees who were at West during that year noted that it was a strategy to grow fast, but the pullback from the state was unexpected and the college paid for that. K. Takeda added that when colleges’ yearly balance ends in a loss, the district covers it, but the college must agree to a repayment plan. Crediting the Vice President of Administrative Services, R. Tillberg noted that except for that year, the College has had positive ending balances for at least the past half-decade, which indicates good fiscal health.

R. Tillberg also distributed handouts presenting Program Review responses regarding the impacts to departments of their resource requests being funded or not being funded. Most requests were not granted. Some of the more typical risks identified in the comments to the requests not being funded were: impact to the quality of the program, additional costs in the future due to deferred maintenance, loss of students to other colleges, and out of date equipment and programs.

There was some discussion about unfunded resource requests. Several attendees were concerned that the stated impacts needed some type of attention. K. Takeda addressed the idea to somehow report these impacts to the state that from a certain perspective one could argue that the state does not wish for colleges to serve more students or deliver more services than they are paying for. He added that one place where the impacts to unfunded requests can be reflected upon would be the committee self-evaluations, arguing that if there are dire consequences for not funding, maybe the committees need to adjust something in the process. R. Tillberg noted that a college’s finances are not flexible because so much is tied up in salary; she and others added that grant funding—which the college has been successful at procuring—can help to fund programs that otherwise might not be.
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Institution Student Learning Outcomes
L. Cordova presented data regarding the assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes at last year’s student poster showcase. He mentioned that the Student Learning Outcomes committee was refining the rubric and adjusting some process issues to address some parts of the poster judging and ILO assessment that could be improved. In discussion there were several suggestions brainstorming ways to get more participants involved in the process or to better display or share data and information about the posters. There was a question as to whether the foundation could assist in supporting certain beneficial campus activities such as the showcase, but K. Takeda reported that the foundation is in rebuilding mode and does not currently have funds to assist the college in such a manner.

In this discussion it was also noted that the originator and current coordinator of the showcase, Holly Bailey-Hofmann, will not continue in her role as poster showcase coordinator going forward. One member noted that there are several key faculty leadership roles (e.g. FPIP coordinator) that are being vacated because the amount of work required to dutifully fulfills these roles is exorbitant given they are not being compensated with faculty reassigned time. There was the feeling that one recommendation to come from this meeting might address the need to develop a system to evaluate and allocate non-contractual reassigned time.

Institution Set Standards
R. Tillberg introduced this section noting that there are five items our accrediting agency requires we report on annually and set standards below which we don’t want to fall. If we fall below one of our institution-set standards, we are therefore not meeting our own standard and need to address the underlying issue.

As she spoke to each standard there were some questions as to how we would address the issues of performance on some of these measures. Other attendees noted that the proposed SEAC (Student Equity, Access, and Completion) committee could explore strategies to increase degrees and certificates, and the Equity plan will help to guide efforts to decrease gaps among different student groups on student achievement outcomes. In addition, the draft Educational Master Plan in progress contains objectives that address the need for identifying pathways for completion, communicating these and providing support to students.

Transfers to UC’s and CSU’s have declined in recent years. R. Tillberg noted that the state trend is a decrease in transfers, to some degree due to statewide budget cuts that reduced the number of spaces and opportunities for community college students to transfer to state universities. In addition, course offerings in the community colleges were cut by roughly a quarter during that time. It was noted that at West, since Summer was cut, our annual course offering reduction was probably closer to 50%.

Scorecard
R. Tillberg with assistance from A. Boateng described the ARCC/Scorecard data and some of its parameters (e.g. each measure reports on a state-identified cohort of students starting at a particular college). Some attendees expressed frustration that while data have been presented about particular trends, and several of the trends are discouraging, there was a need for something more than just an annual presentation of the same trends. One frustration was that the underlying reasons or causal factors motivating these trends was a mystery and should be investigated. Others felt that since some of these negative trends continue, some disciplines or divisions should be informed of the need to take a hard look at their practice and make changes. As the discussion developed, some liked the idea of researching other colleges with similar challenges that have succeeded in improving student achievement. Others wondered if the particularities of the data presented (e.g. ARCC/Scorecard uses statewide data to measure outcomes of students who start at particular colleges), might affect the conclusions we draw about the data presented.

Equity Data
The Equity Data was presented briefly as time remaining for the meeting was becoming short.

Recommendations and Next Steps
As the meeting drew to a close, the group agreed to a set of recommendations. Those remaining after 5:00pm identified tentative responsible parties and committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsible Parties and Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use the new Student Equity, Access, and Completion Committee to identify ways to improve Scorecard measures.</td>
<td>Student Equity Access &amp; Completion Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate the possibility of awarding certificates without requiring an application.</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions &amp; Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research causes for low completion and transfer.</td>
<td>Office of Research &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research course coding to see if courses have the correct CTE codes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research the barriers to awarding certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Research course coding to see if courses have the correct CTE codes.</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutionalize the connection of cohort programs with campus as a whole.</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify colleges that have improved the basic skills progression rates and find out the strategies they used to make the improvement.</td>
<td>Office of Research &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Create a process to identify and evaluate non-contractual reassigned time, such as FPIP chair and ILO Poster Showcase.</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Institutional Effectiveness Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extend the discussion about Scorecard metrics college-wide, for example at Academic Senate, Divisional Council, Division meetings, SEAC, Fall flex day, Spring summit.</td>
<td>Office of Research &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Student Equity Access &amp; Completion Committee</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Adjourned at 5:05pm