

# Planning, Review and Budget Council

Regular Meeting  
November 6, 2013  
Building 400, Room 405  
3:00 – 5:00 PM

## *MINUTES*

Meeting called to order at 3:15 p.m. Minutes of October 23<sup>rd</sup> and October 30<sup>th</sup> reviewed. Minor revisions suggested and recorded by chairs. Both sets of minutes approved.

Changes to agenda. Opportunity & Freedom presentation will be deferred to next week. In that slot today, Mireille will provide an update on SLOAC.

Next week's agenda: Opportunity & Freedom and Passion & Purpose presentations, a continuation of the bottleneck discussion, and an update on the Presidential Task Force.

On November 20<sup>th</sup>, agenda items include an HSI update and Mission statement task force update.

On December 4<sup>th</sup>, Yvonne will present a shared governance functional map.

On December 11<sup>th</sup>, we'll tentatively schedule a SSSP update, and a classified prioritization update.

First agenda item: **Program review** updates.

Ken said we've received most program reviews (44 out of possibly 63), and they will begin to post them and prepare spreadsheets by type of resource requested. The resources will need to be prioritized by division. Assuming the numbers requested are larger than what we have available, then the requests will go to the Budget Committee and other relevant committees (Facilities, etc.). Jennifer suggested that PRBC could provide some guidelines for review. Carolyn suggested that we send out reminders to those that haven't yet submitted their program reviews. Jennifer asked if there are any consequences for turning in program review late. Tram noted that processes to determine resource allocation are about to begin, so yes—there would be consequences if resource requests aren't submitted. Faculty prioritization, for example, will begin on November 12<sup>th</sup>.

Carolyn asked what our process was for reading program reviews. Jennifer explained last year's process, where a reading group read all of them and reported back to PRBC on overall themes. Sandra suggested we develop a process that includes the development of guidelines from PRBC for committees that are allocating resources. Tram suggested that

reading Dean's and VP summaries may also be helpful. Regarding criteria, there need to be some guidelines that relate to our strategic goals that should be shared with the committees prior to the start of those processes. Yvonne noted the importance of ensuring that the CIO is supportive of those guidelines, as our history has been that they have not been well received by the resource allocation committees. We need to ensure that those guidelines have the support of both PRBC and administrators. Eric noted that the faculty prioritization process will entail some tension, and that it will be OK to disagree. Tram suggested that the PRBC chairs meet with the current and incoming VPs, Academic Affairs early in this process so there is alignment.

Marcia questioned how the Program Review Dean's summaries will be used. She uses it to provide feedback to the division on what she saw from the program reviews. The question is whether the Dean's will have any input into prioritization, or if that is now only up to the committees. Eric noted that he didn't complete a Dean's summary last year, and no one ever questioned that. Jan suggested that having the Dean's summaries include some reflection on division-wide priorities would be helpful, as one data point, to the resource allocation committees. Yvonne noted that it would be wise to be proactive and send copies of the dean's summaries to the chairs of each resource allocation committee rather than assume that they will find them on the website. Matt suggested that it would be appreciated if the Deans could have 5 minutes to present a division summary to PRBC.

Tram noted that we tend to swing back and forth between peer review and dean review of program reviews, and perhaps this year we should try to do a bit of both. Jennifer suggested a possible date for a first reading group meeting of Friday, November 22<sup>nd</sup>.

### **Presentation of Houses – Jan & Donna**

Jan – Many people have been involved in the initiative, Jan and Donna are representing that group today.

1. Problems we are looking to solve:
  - Not enough students persisting
  - Our transfer rate is declining
  - Student who state they are on a path that requires math & English haven't taken these classes
2. Why these are happening – many reasons
  - Students without clear goals
  - Student don't know how to achieve their goals
  - Students can't get the classes and/or service they need to achieve their goals
  - Students have goals but are questioning the value of college in meeting them
  - Students aren't connected to the college or each other
  - Factors that are out of our control – but, maybe there are things we can do (see presentation next week)

Matt – some of these are because of funding. Some may be because of the changes in standards/requirements. Cut backs in transfer admissions. They may be hidden within this, but should be recognized.

Carolyn – most students drop for reasons outside of Chabot's control, but maybe we can ameliorate this. We are getting in the way of the students making progress with our schedules and limited services. Some is changing needs and goals.

Donna – the house concept

- We are trying to put together broad groups of students based on related goals/interests. Can tailor services to those area needs, and can make these services scalable. Looking at things to engage students through study groups, events, etc. Would like to have more cross-disciplinary work to bring together more ideas on solutions.
- These houses or communities would be magnets for students. Could explore within field in a guided and thoughtful way.
- Provide access to tailored information and support.
- Can make the units they take count more by helping students make wise class selections.
- Make it easier to navigate Chabot.
- Building community and connection – making students feel like they belong at Chabot. Bringing students, faculty, admin, staff together as communities.

Carolyn – the research really backs up this concept of connections.

Donna –

- Bring completion services to students in more tailored way for jobs, transfer options etc.
- Why would this work. Experience from learning communities and the feeling of belonging they bring. Students report that networking amongst each other is critical to their momentum. Evidence that students with clear goals complete at higher rates as do those that are connected to the campus somehow.
- This is an affordable option because we are calling upon the power of our students to build connections with each other.

Jan – we don't know the number of these houses that we would need, but that they are broad areas. Not the ClassWeb choosing a major. Within a theme this would allow students to explore and to find their next destination.

Marcia – CIN is a current theme on campus. They have been experimenting with different models of how to put together learning communities. Houses could allow that area to design something that works with that theme.

Jan - Puente and Daraja are academically focused, but we are looking at majors/fields focus. And those models aren't scalable to serve all of our students. It would be ideal if people would be in multiple communities; could have nesting—more connections are better.

Christine – would the existing learning communities become part of a house or within a house?

Jan – maybe, it depends on the learning community. CIN might work as a theme within a house, but Daraja wouldn't.

Tram – we have a reputation as a college for learning communities. All of those are around a particular interest, but it isn't around an academic pathway. It is around a particular background most of the time – for instance PACE is evening students. Or it can be around eligibility requirements. This model is a way to make it available to all of our students, because what they all have in common is an academic goal. They have to make a decision to jump into something, so we need to inform them of what that is, what its benefits are, where it can take them.

It may end up looking like cohort classes. It might be faculty working together.

It also addresses campus climate. Different areas should have different feels.

Jan – also the current learning communities are very focused on getting students initially plugged in, this addresses this and the longer term of getting them through years two and three.

Yvonne – students often report that they wished Puente went on for a second year.

Deonne – I think you are saying that this isn't replacing a first year experience, that this would include that as well as for the years beyond.

Tram – when we make students jump in to something without support all the way through, they drift off because of lack of cohesion and contact. This would provide that contact all the way through.

Jim – it seems to me that most of the problem is getting to the second year (for full-time). It seems to me that the first year is where we lose people.

Carolyn – yes, most leave after the first year. But, if they persist they don't complete, they keep coming back.

Jan – of those that make it to the second year, about half don't make it to their goal. This is just a piece. If students don't know what they are doing in the first year this provides them with an attraction and a more guided way to explore, instead of saying choose a major and get on with it.

Tram – a normal student who is just going in and taking classes and knows what they are interested in, we have a series of courses before they can even start in their major. For example, computer science majors: we don't embrace that student in computer science until they start taking CS classes, not while they are approaching, fulfilling pre-requisites. This would tie those initial interests to information and peers that are within their area while they are taking their initial basic classes. It allows them to become engaged with like peers and to form communities earlier.

Jim – That's why I liked last week's presentation. It was very clear about where students could come in and out.

Kristin – is this similar to the career pathways, where we would have flyers available that help with visualizations.

Donna – Those are mostly already in CTE areas, which have clear pathways and clear links to industry standards and jobs. So you can take their idea of mapping, but you have to modify it to fit a larger profile. If we have it thought all out and go out and find the students, we can present them to students as options. It helps them make connections. We would have to modify the Career Ladders because it really isn't focused on transfers, and those jobs are more remote and not as clearly mapped.

Donna – The outcomes are all tied to the strategic plan. There were multiple proposals in Program Review to start houses.

Note that all of the proposals begin with getting people in the room to do the planning.

Jan – what we want from PRBC is where do we go from here with this? We have been working on this for a year, and we can see three paths forward:

1. We don't like this particular idea, but here is an alternative that achieves our goal.
2. There are three large groups that have expressed an interest and have submitted proposals in program review. Should we start with those who want to go in this direction?
3. Number 2 wouldn't serve all of our students, so can we find a way to build support for some versions of this concept so we can serve *all* of our students.

Christine – where I get lost is structurally is what is needed, what would be required to do this? Are we going to divert our meager resources from current services, such as counseling, to develop these? The reality is I don't know if we have the faculty gumption to get this done? Do we devote a full-time faculty member, which is what these proposals add up to, and do these initiatives or do we take that resource and deploy it into an area that desperately needs the manpower now?

Eric – For clarity, are we saying statements of feedback to the presentation, or are we asking questions?

Question – I'm trying to understand how what you are proposing is different from what we have now? Reading the goal of the initiative, I don't disagree with the statement but how is it different from the faculty member's perspective and from the student perspective?

Jan – An example from business, if you want to transfer to a UC you only need one business class. You aren't connected to a community of students; they don't get into the field until later, their second year. We need to get them to see options before they get that far.

Eric – I still don't understand, specifically how will the business student who doesn't take a business class until his second year be affected differently?

Tom – it is like Disneyland, it helps you locate yourself within a large unfamiliar place. Students will go into an area that has intentionality to it, to provide exposure.

Becky – with the SSSP, we will be doing lots of this. We will be developing a first year experience class that is themed. Right now, I was really excited to see counselors included in the housing proposals, but with upcoming retirements we won't have enough counselors to cover this and provide the required services for the SSSP. We are very supportive of collaborations and theming, but sometimes our voices get pushed to the side.

Sandra – what do we need to do now to move forward on this?

Yvonne – to look at the funding issue. The scalability and general commitment to this is general fund in the long term. When I look at the new initiatives, this is planning stuff that you would use categorical or grant funding for. It is developing the infrastructure and getting it set up. There are a couple pots of money – HPN is currently piloting a mini-version of a learning community, we could start piloting there; there is the HSI coming; there is the TAACT Grant. There is some current funding available to start.

Tram – hopefully once the infrastructure is set, then sustaining would just be redistributing.

Sandra - this will continue to another meeting, so we can get to SLOAC.

Mirielle –

Asked how important SLOAC work is to accreditation. Jim answered it's critical. Mireille distributed a handout illustrating the issues—problems with e-Lumen, lack of leadership, lack of membership, sporadic attendance. Tram has been discussing the technology issues with District IT, and there seems to be greater focus on this issue and commitment to resolve it. Wayne questioned the depth of our commitment to e-Lumen. Apparently, e-Lumen was working OK prior to the last upgrade. Tram has been in contact with e-Lumen. Wayne asked if CurricuNet could be an option. Tram said possibly.

Yvonne commented on the difficulties we seem to have getting people to take on chair responsibilities, and wonders if there may be administrative solutions to partially ease the problem—perhaps hiring an administrator—a Director of Assessment & Learning.

Jennifer commented on the issue that positions that were supposed to be institutionalized with our Title III grant haven't been institutionalized—that the funding just isn't there to

do that. The SLOAC chair position is currently only funded at 3 CAH, where it was once a full-time position.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.