



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Cañada College Planning & Budget Committee Meeting**  
**September 17, 2014**

<p><b>Members Present:</b></p> <p>Gregory Anderson, Vice President of Instruction Lizette Bricker, Classified Staff Representative At-Large Lawrence Buckley, President (non-voting) Nicholas Carr, Representative for Athletics, Learning Resources and Library Division Javier Santos Castro, ASCC Student Representative Jennifer Castello, Faculty Representative, Humanities Division Loretta Davis, CSEA Representative Sara Harmon, Part-Time Faculty Representative At-Large John Hashizume, Facilities Representative Douglas Hirzel, PBC Co-Chair and Academic Senate President Chialin Hsieh, Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness David Johnson, Administrative Representative Deborah Joy, Classified Senate Representative Victoria Nunes, College Business Officer Karen Olesen, Faculty Representative, Student Services Division Martin Partlan, Faculty Representative, Science &amp; Technology Division Jeffrey Rhoades, SSPC Representative Robin Richards, Vice President of Student Activities Lina Tsvirkunova, ASCC Student Representative Lezlee Ware, AFT Representative</p>	<p><b>Members Absent:</b></p> <p>Paul Naas, Faculty Representative, Business, Design, and Workforce Development</p> <p><b>Others Present:</b></p> <p>Regina Blok Jeanne Gross, Professor Linda Hayes Matt Lee Kim Lopez Jo'an Rosario Tanaka Anniqua Rana</p>
--	---

The meeting was called to order at 2:12 p.m.

**1) Approval of the Planning & Budget Committee (PBC) Meeting Minutes**

The September 3, 2014 meeting minutes were unanimously approved with the correction that Item D. Student Services Success Program (SSSP), third bullet, Budget, would be approved by the PBC at the September 17, 2014 meeting.

The May 21, 2014 meeting minutes will be approved at the October 1, 2014 PBC Meeting.

**2) A. ACCJC Follow-Up Report**

(Refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>, ACCJC Follow-Up Report & SSSP Plan)

Dean Hsieh presented the ACCJC Follow-Up Report and asked the Committee if they had any major feedback, suggestions, or substantial changes that needed to be made.

A motion was made by Vice President Anderson to approve the ACCJC Follow-Up Report. Second: Vice President Richards- Motion Passed.

### **Student Success Support Program Plan (SSSP)**

Dean Lopez requested a tentative approval of the SSSP Budget due to the fact that the State has not approved an allocation yet. Dean Lopez has been working on the budget with Kathy Blackwood, San Mateo County Community College (SMCCCD) Executive Vice Chancellor. The budget is very close to what may be allocated for FY 2014/2015 based on the formula and the percentages that were received for FY 2013/2014.

A motion was made by Ms. Nunes to approve, in spirit, the tentative SSSP Budget, due to the fact that the State has not provided the allocation at this point in time. The College should receive the official allocation on October 1, 2014. Second: Ms. Bricker - Motion Passed.

### **B. Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Report**

(Refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>, 2013-2014 ILO Assessment Reports)

Mr. Hirzel and Dean Hsieh updated the Committee on the ILO Report that is currently being accessed at Cañada College. Surveys were completed by students who were close to graduating or petitioned for graduation. Dean Hsieh reported that multiple measures were used to measure our ILO. The Graduation Survey (Fall 2013) and Student Satisfaction Surveys (Spring 2014) are currently being analyzed. The idea behind the ILO Report is to determine if Cañada College should change any of their current programs to improved students' ability to achieve the ILOs.

In the 2014 ILO Assessment, the Executive Summary shows that Cañada College is stable. There was not a huge difference when comparing the graduates with the non-graduates.

The result was based on a total of 11 respondents for fall 2013 and 1,100 for spring 2014. Of the 1,100 respondents, 244 were graduating students.

Question was raised: "Could we compare the result (fall 2013 and spring 2014) with spring 2013?" The answer was no. The spring 2013 survey was based on a 5 point scale compared to a 4 point scale.

Dean Hsieh will include the number of students who took the survey in the Executive Summary. A suggestion was made to combine the two outcomes.

President Buckley pointed out that the report was a self-identifying study that asked students if they have been successful. He gave the example that Mr. Hashizume and he attended schools that were dominated by the Asian culture and education. In their circumstances, no one would be able to identify themselves with the masses. President Buckley felt that campus to campus, culture to culture, would change the results and the report would not be as reflective as it could be.

Discussion pursued amongst the Committee:

- Graduates do not include individuals who received certificates.
- If certificates are degrees, consider the pathway students took to earn the degree. If they haven't achieved all the ILO's, then they just made it to transfer.

- A suggestion, for future ILO surveys was to compare:
  - Students who received a certificate
  - Students who met their transfer goals
  - Students who received a degree
- Focus on students who graduate or are going to transfer and those students who may continue on. Did the students achieve?
- Have anonymous surveys asking students the number of units they had taken to transfer.
- Ask students to complete the survey using their G#.
- If the software, Survey Monkey or Novi Survey, was used the students would have to log in using their e-mail information or G#.

Students who completed the Student Satisfaction Survey were given the opportunity to win one of three \$100 gift certificates.

In the fall 2013, the ILO survey showed that students ranked themselves high; this year's survey demonstrates the same trend.

Mr. Hirzel and Dean Hsieh asked the Committee:

- What do we want to do with this data?
- In terms of comparing year to year, should we set a benchmark? If the benchmark was met, would this mean we would be happy with the ILO?
- How much do we expect this to change?

Discussion continued:

- An ePortfolio identifies more about a student because it uses multiple measures.
- With all of the services the students are getting, the level of achievement for their success should go up.
- The benchmark is already high, should we set a lower benchmark?
- How much information can be gathered, how do the students groups compare to one another?
- Are students feeling more significant in one group vs. another?
- Based on the five ILO's, the numbers are only slightly different.
- Students feel good, they learn a lot, and feel a sense of community.
- If the survey was given to early, students may not understand what is being asked of them.

Mr. Carr asked if after only one year, is it too early to set a benchmark? Maybe we need to have additional information.

Dean Hsieh said that last year the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) was used and it showed the number of college graduates vs. non-graduates. The result from non- graduates were higher than the result from graduates. This year, we used Student Satisfaction Survey asked the similar questions and the results were reversed. CCSSE accesses every other year, not in FY 2014/2015 but the following FY. Currently it is too early to complete the benchmark; we would need to wait until we have the CCSSE results.

Some Committee members felt that this information was only partially useful. The question was brought up, if we are measuring General Education (GE), why would we be mixing it with other populations of students? It was suggested that the data should be compared with past data.

Ms. Gross was invited back to speak to the Committee regarding the ePortfolio Project Report for ILO Assessment. Refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/academics/iloassessment.php>, ILOs Rubrics and ePortfolio Results.

The objective was to use rubrics to evaluate student eportfolios for student achievement of Cañada's Institutional Learning Outcomes and to explore how to make ePortfolios a worthwhile tool for Cañada faculty and students.

The task force first addressed these questions: 1) Are the current rubrics workable, 2) Should portfolios be assessed in faculty groups or individually and 3) Which ILOs will be scored?

Ms. Gross said that there were links to 130 ePortfolios. The ePortfolios were primarily from ECE students or from Biology, Engineering, and Math. Thirty accessible ePortfolios were evaluated by three faculty groups, which were balanced with faculty from different departments and divisions and with a mix of faculty who were new to this assessment process and those who had served last year. Upon reviewing the rubrics, the assessment participants decided to tweak the Critical Thinking rubric. The Quantitative Reasoning rubric may also need some revision this year.

The assignments submitted to specific PLOs and ILOs were evaluated by the faculty groups for as many ILOs as possible since the student work represented possible ILO achievement across disciplines. For example, work from Biology students was evaluated for Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning as well as Communication. No student work for the Creativity ILO was submitted and only one ePortfolio was assessed for the Community ILO.

Some highlights from the assessment were: 1) Results of the Communication ILO showed that only 2 of 26 ePortfolios, were rated as below basic for conventions of English language, 2) Quantitative ILO results had a high overall average of 2.87 for all three elements and 3) Reflections scored much better this year, averaging 2.5 and 2.3 for each element, compared with the highest Reflection score of 1.51 last year. Possible explanations for the improvement in Reflection scores are that Reflections were put before the Assignment link and there may have been additional instruction by faculty concerning Reflection.

The Assessment Team also evaluated the overall ePortfolios Assessment process. They felt that the ILOs were clear and could be easily applied, it was important to work in cross-disciplinary faculty groups; and, it would be more effective if more faculty were involved.

Ms. Gross said that Carol Rhodes' takeaway thoughts on ePortfolios were that there is value for both students and for faculty in the use of ePortfolios for PLOs and ILO assessment:

- ePortfolios enhance student learning
- Students can add digital speeches and artwork.
- Students could use ePortfolios in obtaining scholarships, internships and financial aid
- Students own their ePortfolios and can use them throughout their academic careers and beyond
- Student work is easily accessible for faculty assessment
- Faculty can assess actual student work
- Reviewing student work across Divisions and Departments makes rich dialog possible

Ms. Gross said there are areas that could use some improvements. Additional development of signature assignments would be helpful, and there is room for more faculty involvement.

Vice President Anderson thanked the Assessment Team for their good work. He liked the concepts of working in groups and with the adjunct faculty. He would like to see more groups reviewing ePortfolios.

**C. Workgroup – Continuing Discussion on Benchmarks**

Refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>, 2013-2014 Benchmark Report)

Dean Hsieh received feedback regarding degree and certificate completion and reported that the numbers are up. She said that it was determined that August was not a good time to run reports; new reports will be run in September. A footnote was added on Page 1 of 2 that Benchmarks were established in spring 2013.

Discussion pursued amongst the Committee:

The first seven benchmarks have to be reported to the State.

Do the Benchmarks need to be reported as a total instead of ratio?

The Senate was concerned about the numbers because enrollment was going down. If you have fewer students enrolled, but the same percent graduate, the total number of graduates will decrease. This decrease doesn't mean the college is less effective, rather it is just as effective as before the enrollment decline.

It was proposed that the college internally review its rate of degree completion, in addition to the total number of graduates.

The whole State is still struggling with the degree completion ratio as well as the transfer completion ratio. As long as Cañada College has the degree number, we should be fine. Degree completion takes 3-5 years based on cohort comparisons. It gets dicey to figure out that piece. A suggestion was to have the Standard I work group study and proposal on cohort comparisons for degree completion to create degree completion ratio and bring the proposal back to PBC.

On the Cañada College Benchmarks and Goals 2013-2104 Report, the Fall-to-fall persistence rate (%) (First-Time Student) of 40% was not resolved. With the history of 41% in 2011/2012, 46% in 2012/2013, and 42% in 2013/2014, the question was brought forth, should we keep the Inspirational Goal at 40%?

What are the numbers for the rest of the District? It is in the state database. It is not about completion but collaboration.

50 years of data has shown it hasn't changed and success hasn't changed.

President Buckley said he understood the argument; it is an Inspirational Goal, not a number that is going to be tracked by ACCJC. He said we should want 100% as the Inspirational Goal. He felt that you don't change the bearings or outcome if you don't set the goal on what you have been changing for 50 years. Community Colleges have transformed over the last 50 years. Many of the buildings on college campuses were built for Drafting, Welding, and Automotive career fields; the buildings were built to meet those program's needs. College buildings need to be changed to meet 21<sup>st</sup> Century needs.

Ms. Castello said that students are not the same as 50 years ago; they don't drop out, they stop out, and come back. It would be nice if that could be incorporated in the measure. Some students come

for a year; they are happy and then leave. After another couple of years they may want to come back and take more courses. How do you measure that? She felt we need to understand our students better and create an environment that works for the students, maybe that was the problem all along.

It would be important to distinguish the students on the different types of students. For example, students who intend to stay here more than a year, what does our rate look like? We don't know the percentage of the students who are short timers.

The message to the students should be that we are 100% behind you.

Mr. Hirzel said there are different programs out there, such as Spark Point to help students from starting and stopping; Ms. Castello disagrees. She said opportunities come up and they take a different path and then come back.

Vice President Richards asked if we should have a 2.a. and a 2.b. and change the percentage to 50% and then review the different types of student educational goals--Degree, Transfer, and certificate.

Mr. Hirzel asked if the Benchmarks and Goals were numbered in a certain way. Ms. Richards said they are in the same order as they would be listed in the Accreditation Annual Report.

On page 1 of 2 on the Cañada College Benchmarks and Goals 2013-2014, should the column title be, Aspirational Goal not Inspiration Goal. You could then look at those goals and give Cañada College something to aspire too. For example, Fall-to-spring persistence rate (%) (First-Time Student) is now at a 62% Inspirational Goal; maybe it should be 70%.

The question was brought to the Committee asking if one of the work groups would like to look at this and bring back to the PBC. The Committee agreed and decided on the Standard I work group.

Mr. Hirzel said that one the questions raised last spring during the evaluation of benchmarks was "what is the college doing to change these metrics?" One answer to this is that some of our institutional plans' goals are directed to improving them. For example, praise was given to the authors of the Student Engagement Plan because they did an excellent job linking their goals and objectives with the Benchmarks. The Distance Education plan and the Strategic Enrollment plan both have goals/objectives that link to the Benchmarks. Progress on these plans will hopefully translate into more successful Benchmarks.

Dean Hsieh said the Cañada College Benchmarks and Goals 2013-2014 was shared at the Administrative Planning Council (APC) Meeting two weeks ago. Currently we don't have specific strategies to reach our goal. We have it, but it is not firmed up at this point in time.

Vice President Anderson asked if we could link the benchmarks and show how they are tied to the existing college plans. (i.e., Strategic Enrollment Plan, Student Engagement Plan, Student Equity Plan, DE Plan, etc.)

Ms. Joy thought maybe footnotes could be added that identifies which plans they are tied to.

The Mission, Planning, and Goals Workgroup (Standard I) may want to work with other workgroups on it too.

Dean Hsieh and Vice President Richards suggested, changing the Fall-to-spring persistence rate (%) (First-Time Student) from 62% to 70% as a start.

#### **D. Setting 2014/2015 PBC Goals**

President Buckley and Mr. Hirzel reported on setting 2014/2015 PBC Goals. The question was brought forth, what can you do for this Committee? President Buckley, Ms. Joy, and Mr. Hirzel brainstormed some ideas. President Buckley said that as a new President at Cañada College he had a lot to learn. One of the first things he did was review all of the planning documents trying to understand the direction of the College. This past summer during the Administrative Retreat, managers, directors, deans, and vice presidents, all took a look at the planning documents. After reading the planning documents and the Strategic Plan, they noticed the plans were all laid out with certain goals and objectives. The verbiage was very different in each of the documents and the question formed as to who is responsible for these plans? Some of the goals and objectives should be turned into operational plans. There were misspelled words, some topics were called goals, others called outcomes, or activities.

President Buckley spent a weekend attempting to create an index where he would go through all of the plans and determine like goals; then, he would look at the objectives, followed by creating an operational plan. He reported that a lot of time and effort by the administration, faculty, and staff has been put into these plans. During this process, President Buckley quickly realized that the language was very different in each of the plans. This led him to the determination that we need to have someone do this for us. Discussion was held at the President's Council meeting that Cañada College should hire an Editor; someone who would sit down with all of the plans and review them. It was suggested to hire a Technical Writer. They would have the skill set to create and edit the plans so they would all work together.

President Buckley said that Cañada College was pressed to get these plans done due to the Accreditation cycle to get these plans done.

The Committee made the following suggestions/comments:

- A standard language should be used. For example, in Project Management, the terms are universal.
- Have an integrated calendar to update the plans; right now it is sort of a mess.
- Currently it is an unproductive nightmare to determine how we are doing in these plans. We are implementing these plans; however, implementation of plan A may not know the implementation of plan B. We are siloes in this process.
- When one outcome comes out it could meet the goal of other plans.
- Evaluate the plans and maybe combine the plans. That wouldn't work because the ACCJC wants the different plans.

Dean Hsieh would like the Committee to think about the cycle. She said that we are more than half way through the planning cycle. If we are going to do this, we would need to think about the future. We need to invest for the future as well, the past is already gone.

During the May 21, 2014 PBC Meeting, the Committee discussed the following goals for next year:

- Update the Participatory Governance Manual
- One calendar for all committees
- Add PC reports to agenda
- Communication
- Improve planning to budgeting process – 74 objectives, consolidate?

Vice President Anderson would like to add Professional Development in an effort to get better at it for faculty, student services, and the administration. Create a set of 'next steps' on how we can take additional steps to move forward.

Mr. Hirzel proposed a To-Do List, listing the things that need to happen this year, based on the workgroups and who is responsible for what. For example, the Governance workgroup could update the Participatory Governance Manual. Mr. Hirzel would like to have the right people look at the tasks and invite additional members outside of the workgroup/PBC as needed.

Vice President Richards asked if the organization could be added to the member's page. We could reach out to others outside of the committee.

**E. Progress Report on Educational Master Plan to Strategic Plan**

Dean Hsieh reported that the Progress Reports on the Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan are a work in progress. She will bring these progress reports for both Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan to the next Committee meeting.

**F. All College Program Review Timeline**

(Please refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>, Program Review Timeline & Staffing Process Timeline Revision)

Instructional Planning Council (IPC) has set a new timeline for instructional program reviews. Mr. Hirzel would like to propose a college wide timeline so all groups (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Planning Councils) are on the same timeline.

Program review should synchronize with the spring hiring proposals. Student Services is concerned that they have enough time for discussion at SSPC to determine which positions to put forward. If there isn't enough time for those discussions, SSPC will likely put forward in spring whichever positions they didn't get in the fall hiring process.

Dean Hsieh said the timeline needs to be matched—program review plan due in February 2015, hiring proposals can be submitted for spring 2015 or fall 2015 hiring. When programs create their proposals for hiring, they may need to give updated data. Resource requests (e.g. new position proposals) can be updated every year, but the program review is updated biennial.

The Program Review Plans are due before February, they are not dictated through the timeline.

Ms. Wares said that in regards to the timeline schedule, the Humanities and Social Sciences would like to be grouped together.

Motion: A motion was made by Vice President Anderson to accept the new timeline that calls for the end of February as the new College deadline for Program Reviews and Resource Requests. Second: Dean Hsieh. Abstained: Mr. Castro - Motion Passed.

**G. Budget and Equipment Requests**

(Please refer to <http://www.canadacollege.edu/planningbudgetingcouncil/meetings.php>, Budget Update and Equipment Budget Report)

Ms. Nunes gave an overview of allocation in Fund 1, Prop 30, and Measure G.



Fund 11002, Prop 30, could not pay administrative costs.

The District set aside \$400,000 for equipment for 4 years and increased that to 7 years.

Fund 31131, State Inst'l Equipment, used to be split between the Facilities, Planning, Maintenance, & Operations Department and the 3 colleges. But these instructional plan monies came with strings – deadlines for expenditure that couldn't be met by the three colleges. So, Ms. Blackwood gave all the monies from State Instructional Equipment to the Facilities, Planning, Maintenance, & Operations Department and none to the colleges. FPMO would have no problem expending the funds within the short timeframe. Ms. Nunes said that effectively Ms. Blackwood is taking away \$46,000/year from the college but, in return will give Cañada College \$400,000/year instead.

Mr. Hashisume said that of the 2.5 million that Ms. Blackwood gave to the Facilities, Planning, Maintenance, & Operations Department, Cañada College did get a portion of it. It will be used for much-needed infrastructure projects, but these will not be highly visible (e.g. underground utilities).

A motion was made by Ms. Castello to allow Ms. Nunes to continue for another 5 minutes with her report. Second: Vice President Richards- Motion Passed.

Ms. Nunes said that Cañada College had enough money to fund all instructional equipment requests that came through 2013-14 Program Review.

Equipment and computers/printers are being replaced as fast as they can. The Technology Committee, working with ITS, has started to develop criteria for replacing equipment, computers/printers. Once the criterion is developed, Ms. Nunes will bring the document back to the PBC.

**H. Division/Committee Reports**

None

**I. Next Steps**

Due to time constraints it was determined to forego this agenda item.

**J. Matters of Public Interest**

Vice President Anderson will be working with the Administration to mobilize a Disaster Relief Fund. He has heard pockets of concern at the College, along with all three of the College Senates, who are all interested in assisting families who are being affected by the Weed, California fire. He said that many of the families affected by the fire serve an already challenged population. Mr. Castro will be working with the Cañada College students.

President Buckley reported that this past Monday, September 15, 2014, he sent out the *Olive Hill Press* reporting that Noel Chavez will be participating in the Mobility Fair in Guadalajara, Mexico City, Oaxaca, Merida, and Monterrey, as well as visit local high schools in Guadalajara and Mexico City. President Buckley clarified that the District Office organizes the recruitment for international students. Mr. Chavez will be accompanying one of the District representatives on one of the trips to Mexico. All that Cañada College will be contributing is his time.

**K. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 p.m.