

# Planning, Review and Budget Council

Regular Meeting  
October 16, 2013  
Building 400, Room 405  
3:00 – 5:00 PM

## *MINUTES*

**Present:** Jan Novak, Kristin Land, Ken Grace, Tom Clark, Jim Matthews, Eric Schultz, Marcia Corcoran, Meriella Giovanola, Andrew Pierson, Sandra Genera, Kathy Kelly, Becky Plaza, Carey Kopay, Deonne Kunkel, Jennifer Lange, Patricia Shannon, Carolyn Arnold, Susan Sperling, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Donna Gibson, Yvonne Wu-Craig, Catherine Powell, Matt Kritscher, Sara Parker, Nigel Quadri (student), Charrles Parra (student), Chad McCain (Student), ValJean Dale

Meeting called to order at 3:10 p.m.

Review of minutes from October 2, 2013. Sandra pointed out next week's agenda items: Opportunity & Freedom and Houses initiatives. Jan will confirm if Tom will be here to present O&F. Houses will be presented. She also discussed October 30<sup>th</sup> agenda items: Career Ladders and Major Exploration Pathways. Sandra will confirm with Catherine Pinkas if she or someone else would be able to present that on the 30<sup>th</sup>. Sara asked if these are follow-ups on strategic plan initiatives. The answer is yes, although the presentations on the 30<sup>th</sup> are not ongoing initiatives but alternatives for pathway exploration.

Action items: Sandra reported that she is still exploring a program review email address. Updated forms (in Word and Excel format) are now posted on the PRBC website.

Marcia asked how PRBC will be connected to faculty prioritization. That will be initiated by the VP, Academic Services Office. But, we should provide some guidelines/criteria to that committee based on the strategic plan. This will be placed on the agenda for a future meeting on November 6<sup>th</sup>. Matt offered to update on mandatory matriculation on November 13<sup>th</sup>. His offer was accepted.

Andrew asked if the HSI grant will be presented to PRBC. The answer is yes. The first meeting of HSI group will be tomorrow (October 17<sup>th</sup>) at 1 pm. This topic will be placed on a future PRBC agenda. It was presented to PRBC last Spring, but work will restart to be in a position to present a grant proposal next Spring if funding is available.

Next topic: PRBC Measurement Team presentation. Carolyn distributed a handout of her PowerPoint. (Please attach to minutes.) This committee began its work last Fall. Carolyn explained that IR works on the first part of the goal—measuring progress, while the rest of the college works to actually develop and implement initiatives that increase the number. She identified challenges to increasing the number of students that achieve their educational goals:

1. Achievement of goals is a long-term outcome, while our work focuses more on short term objectives.
2. Students have different goals. They don't move in lock-step toward one goal.

So, we need to monitor different types of students with different goals, starting places and speeds. They will have different “reasonable” times to completion, and will need different types of support. Carolyn explained the development of the new ed goal groupings. (Refer to the PowerPoint.)

Highlights: Basic Skills FT and PT are the largest groups. “Traditional” college students (full-time, college-ready) are a very small group—8%. The group that has changed in size the most is the Skills Builder group, which has declined from 21% to 12% in the past five years. Much speculation about why this has occurred: class reductions in PE, Art & Music, or changes in the economy.

As we look at historical progress by each of these groups, some key points emerge. First, progress really levels off after 4 years, regardless of where you start or if you’re full-time or part-time. Second, Basic Skills students never reach the progress levels of College-Ready students. Those not assessed really don’t make progress, and are further disadvantaged by registration priorities. Jennifer mentioned that we might need to do something to help those part-time students get the classes they need. If they assess into Basic Skills and have low priority reg, they are really disadvantaged.

Carolyn raised questions to ponder: *what types of programs & initiatives can really change these numbers, and by how much do we expect to increase the numbers?* There has been no sustainable improvement in those numbers over the past 20 years or so. We did better on transfer on the quarter system, and better right when we switched to semesters as students hurried to get out. Kathy mentioned that there’s psychology behind this. It may also encourage us to look at other scheduling options, such as intercessions.

Kristin asked how these numbers will reflect students that come here from other community colleges or leave here to go to other community colleges.

Jan asked if/when we will establish progress measures to know if we’ve achieved the strategic plan goal. Carolyn needs to crunch more data to get baseline numbers, and we can then have the discussion about goals. Jim noted that this may be important to our accreditation self-study. Marcia suggested that we may need different interventions for different groups. Sara questioned if we need numerical goals to know if we’ve achieved something. Tram responded that we should have some framework for reflection, as we are a learning institution.

Next topic: classified prioritization. This topic will be tabled to next week.

Kathy announced the Academic Senate Area B meeting this Friday, and invited interested faculty to attend as the conversations are likely to be relevant to our discussions at PRBC.

Next topic: Chabot Mission, Vision & Goals. Tram presented a PowerPoint (please attach to minutes). She provided an overview of team members and the timeline, which calls for a quick and intensive discussion among the college to come to a college-wide recommendation to College Council and presentation at the January Board meeting. She also discussed the process the task force has used to date, and distributed a second handout that is the “dissection of the mission statement” (please attach to minutes). The group determined that the mission should be broad vs. narrow, based at least partially on ACCJC standards. Task force members expanded on the process used to come up with at least a preliminary draft. In the table on pages 2-3, the left column represents the current mission statement, the center column the questions that were raised, and the third column possible revisions. Jim walked the committee through the two pages, providing explanatory comments.

Tram noted that the mission doesn’t live by itself; it needs to be seen in conjunction with the vision, college-wide learning goals and values.

The question for the committee is where do we go from here? Trish commented on the value of the process, and asked that we further simplify and get more direct as well on the values and college-wide learning goals. Matt seconded that, but questioned if we needed more emphasis on preparing students for work. Marcia commented on the connection between the strategic plan and the mission—that the mission could be able to highlight direction for future strategic plans by identifying what is possible vs. where we are now. Jim noted that we probably don't have time to revise college-wide learning goals and values in time for a January Board meeting. The charge was to focus on the Mission. Susan asked if we could tackle it all now. Yvonne suggested that perhaps the Standard 1 accreditation team could have this as part of their planning agenda.

Susan asked Jim how many more people are needed on accreditation teams. Jim said at least 20 more. Susan made a plea that others engage, as this is not only about our students, but about our livelihood...and that all of us actively recruit more accreditation team members, that we don't start this accreditation work until we have recruited those 20 members.

Tram urged us to just focus on the mission for now, but acknowledge that the values and college-wide learning goals help inform the mission.

Jan suggested that we bring it out to the various constituencies sooner rather than later, and get broader feedback rather than picking it apart now. We'll have another opportunity to look at it and chime in.

Group consensus is to proceed with presenting to the groups, focusing on the chart, and focusing only on the mission.

Next topic: Bottlenecks. Jennifer shared a summary of all of the work done last fall and spring. (Please attach to minutes.) The handout identifies the biggest bottlenecks, the causes of those bottlenecks, and potential methods to address bottlenecks.

Mireille asked if we could provide more examples of Life Science GE lecture & Life Science GE lab courses. Matt also suggested that we expand the list of Communication GE classes just to have a more complete list.

Jennifer noted that the number of courses enrolled over 100% is starting to fall. It may be because faculty are just getting tired of taking on so much more additional work. Or, it could be somehow related to the waitlist, or just declines in enrollment at the college. She also questioned why we have students with no priority number in our bottleneck classes. Some priority students appear to drop before the class begins. Why? Could be drops for non-payment, or other issues.

Given time constraints, further discussion on the topic was deferred to a future meeting. Jennifer asked for volunteers for her workgroup. Sara volunteered, and Chad (student) and Matt suggested Jane Church might be interested and helpful. Committee members are asked to review Jennifer's handout for a short discussion at the start of the next meeting. Discussion ensued about fielding a student survey to further understand student registration behavior and swirling. Nigel (student) commented that he does drop classes before they begin as classes he really needs become available, as he needs to ensure he has enough classes to remain a full-time student.

The discussion of the task force was tabled to the next meeting.  
Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.