



PLANNING AND BUDGET STEERING COMMITTEE

Summary Meeting Notes December 2, 2015

APPROVED February 3, 2016

Members Present: Co-chair: Carlos Ayon; **Management Reps:** Cyndi Grein, Rich Hartmann; **Faculty Rep:** Samuel Foster; **Classified Rep:** Bev Pipkin; **Student Reps:** Adam Ascencio, Niko Diehr, and Alternate Taylor Gaetje.

Members Absent: Co-chair: Richard Storti; **Faculty Rep:** Pete Snyder; **Classified Rep:** Tracy Thackrah.

Resource Members Present: Terry Cox, Melisa Hunt.

Guest: Faculty Member Doug Eisner.

The meeting commenced at 2:10 p.m.

I. Approval of Summary Meeting Notes: The November 18, 2015 Summary Meeting Notes were unanimously approved.

II.A. Planning Update - Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Update: At the last meeting, Carlos presented the Framework of Indicators report based on the ARCC Group. For comparison purposes, at today's meeting he distributed the same report format based instead on HSI Eligible Colleges from the NCES comparison group and led a discussion on the reported data. He also distributed a handout listing the colleges under the NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) and ARCC Groups.

Bev Pipkin inquired if there was any data to tell us why our numbers are low. Carlos would like to create campus focus groups to look for examples or reasons why our scores are lower than expected. Doug Eisner stated that the data for "completion rates" may be misleading because he has knowledge that at other colleges, faculty are asked not to drop "no show" students from classes, which results in higher completion rates and the ability to collect FTES and financial aid. At Fullerton College, rosters are cleared before census so there is not a negative effect on financial aid. It was suggested to research the percentage dropped by faculty at other schools and the number of enrollments versus the number of successfully completed. Carlos stated that the number of students that drop on-line is in the thousands as compared to only about 100 students being dropped by faculty for being a no-show.

Course Completion Rate: The committee discussed how we are doing as a college and how we can increase our course completion rates. A member suggested that a possible reason for the low completion rate may be that we grew so fast that we gained more "at-risk students", which attributed to our lower number. Several of these new students were first-time, financial-aid college students and we as a college may not be meeting their needs. With Student Equity, SSSP, additional Academic Support Services, and related funding, we are now in a position to provide support and serve these particular students and we should begin to see the numbers increase/improve.

Assessment: High school tests may be more accurate than our assessment test because students may not be aware how the assessment process may affect their college career and placement in college classes. Perhaps we need to promote more emphasis on the importance of the assessment test as some don't take it serious enough and may score lower than expected. Some students take the test without preparation, and for some, this may result in them being placed in remedial math classes where they may become bored and not successfully complete the course. A solution may be to offer "open/exit" math classes for students who failed remedial classes where a student can retake the module they failed rather than repeating the entire course. A comment was made that maybe we are assessing students in the wrong ways. Students may be bored in a class where they have mastered all but one module in a math class, for example, which ultimately leads to the student failing the class.

Goal-setting: The PBSC will need to focus on goal-setting after the new data comes out in March. We as a college need to determine what it is that we want to focus on as our goal. It is understood that it is acceptable to be low in a score if we are not making an attempt to develop a plan to improve on that particular score. It should be noted that the number of completed certificates in the reported data does not capture those certificates attained that require less than 18 units to complete. This skews the data because many of our certificates are less than 18 units, with some only requiring 6 units. Additionally, only those certificates approved by the State Chancellor's Office are captured in the report. Our goal for this indicator may be to maintain 300 + or -. As for the "Complete of Degrees" indicator, our goal may be "to grow marginally". The indicator for "Number of students who transfer to a 4-year institution" is a figure that we can't set a realistic goal for because the number of students accepted at 4-year institutions is out of our control.

A reason for students not being able to complete their certificate in a timely manner may stem from the fact that not all classes are offered each semester and students need to be aware of that fact and plan ahead. Before the college sets a goal to increase the number of certificates or degrees attained, we need to be aware that students planning to transfer to a 4-year institution are not focused on taking the related required classes and may fall short of earning a certificate or degree, which for some may be only 1 or 2 classes because they are only interested in completing the transfer requirements. When the PBSC begins the goal-setting process, we need to define our brand, what our emphasis will be, and base it on what our students are looking for: certificates, degrees, or transfers.

A member would like to know the score data for our CTE-related and cosmetology certificated programs. To help assess why students aren't completing classes, Sam would like data on the course completion rates for Basic Skills vs. other courses. The PBSC will need to determine how the data will affect goal-setting. If we understand our weaknesses, then we can focus our resources on those areas in which to reach our goals. FC has a 66.5% course completion while others are at 70% and 40%

What if it is the students from the feeder schools that are unprepared for college? Fullerton College is in the second year of offering acceleration classes in English, so we don't have enough data to make a statement on results at this time. We are in year 5 of the 6-year cohort so the changes we set in our goals will not be affected. When goal-setting, we need to be mindful of which goals we can affect now and which are cohort-based. In regards to Course Completion, we can see the results and thus don't need to wait for cohort data. In regards to Remedial English, we need to ask the department what their goals are and those should be part of their program review.

Next cohort – If we don't have partial numbers, how do we set goals in advance when we are not working with current data. There are several concerns facing the College that need to be recognized when goal setting. We may have 1-year and 3-year goals to see the progress in growth. There was agreement amongst the PBSC members to focus on "successful course completion" as one of the goals, but it requires more discussion. The PBSC needs to be mindful that not all data is cohort-based. Additionally, to be in the Top 50 to 25 is important with a goal to continue to grow. Once goals are set,

who will enforce them? The plan is that the PBSC will make a recommendation to PAC to look at certain areas where we can make headway and further study. Then, the question is what does PAC want to do. One goal is to move to the top quartile, but realistically, we would expect to see only an incremental increase each year. Our College mission will be effective – We prepare students to be successful learners.

It was suggested that the PBSC invite the ESL and math department chairs to our next meeting on February 3, 2016.

III. Budget Update: In Richard's absence, co-chair Ayon reported there is not any new budget information from either the District or the State. The President's Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting scheduled for November 25, 2015 was canceled, so there are no new actions.

IV. Other/General Discussion: Rich Hartmann reported that at the last Deans' Council meeting on December 1, the deans discussed their concern with the process used to allocate instructional equipment funds. He distributed one of many worksheets prepared by the campus deans outlining funding requests that were "endorsed" by the Program Review Committee but not considered as "instructional equipment" due to misinterpretation, which resulted in the requests being overlooked for consideration of potential funding by the PBSC.

Rich stated that the consensus from the deans is that they felt ignored because the details of the funding requests were not carried over from the Program Review Committee to the spreadsheet provided to the PBSC, which resulted in some of the divisions' funding requests not being considered as instructional equipment (IE) because the "title" didn't look like an IE item. These requests were masked under "other items" and ultimately overlooked for potential funding. There is concern that the transparency from the past has been lost. The deans raised two concerns to be addressed: 1) When they want to try something new, there is no money available for non-bucketed, one-time funds to allocate to these types of projects, and 2) When the Program Review Committee prepares the document to be forwarded to the PBSC for funding consideration, the funding requests need to include a clear title and description of what is being asked.

Meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

Meeting Notes were taken and typed by Melisa Hunt.

Next Meeting: February 3, 2016.