

SLOAC Steering Committee/ Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes –

February 2, 2015, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Alice Erskine, Michael Bishow, Kristina Brower, Lorraine DeMello, Jacquie Escobar, Jan Fosberg, Liz Gaudet, Nick Kapp, Lucia Lachmayr, Aaron McVean, Evan Leach, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Guest: Stephen Fredricks

Absent: Steve Aurilio, Nichole Palmer, Alana Utsumi

Documents: Balanced Scorecard Draft

- I. Approval of the 11/24 Minutes—approved as is
- II. A Town Hall on the Campus Climate Survey Results will be in lieu of our SLOAC/ IE meeting. Please announce the event to your division colleagues and encourage them to participate: Monday, February 23, 2- 3:30 in 6203.
- III. Photo of the group
- IV. Balanced Scorecard—Karen provided an overview of Balanced Scorecard (BSC) guiding principles that San Diego Research and Planning Director Cathy Hasson-- the creator of Skyline College’s Balanced Scorecard and former Director of RP—explained to her. The intent was to gain clarity about how to best revise the Balanced Scorecard.
 - A. The BSC is a guidepost for strategic planning. It should be informed by college goals, strategic priorities, and questions the college leadership has.
 - B. The measures aren’t intended to be an exhaustive list, but should provide a “big” picture. Generally a BSC has 20- 25 indicators, but even that number may be high.
 - C. Typically educational institutions scrutinize two areas: external stakeholders and fiscal stability. Being “balanced” involves considering other areas, in this case internal stakeholders and innovation and growth.
 1. “Lead” indicators are what we “put” into the system (e.g., counselors, financial aid, grants, etc.) and “lag” indicators are what comes out of the system (e.g., success rates).
 - D. Data tends to be readily accessible, but not always. Burning questions can inform what goes into the instrument, and meanwhile, the research office can determine if and how it can be researched.
 - E. In creating benchmarks, averages and trends can help to shape a

reasonable range. However, “stretch goals” are also options, especially when relevant initiatives are underway.

V. Balanced Scorecard—Karen will work with Aaron to consolidate and refine the recommendations for feedback and approval (as a draft) by the Accreditation Oversight Committee (AOC), Strategic Planning and Allocation of Resources Committee (SPARC) and College Governance Council (CGC). The BSC will remain a draft to ensure it aligns with the District Balanced Scorecard, which is being created this year. Then it will be finalized.

Proposed Changes for Each Section from sub-committees and the 2013-2014 Institutional Planning Committee (e.g., revise current measures’ benchmarks, which is based on the five year average? replace current indicators with another as a measure to determine if we achieved a goal? introduce new measures to reflect current strategic priorities?)

- A. ES 5- 10—see [below](#) for recommendations
 1. Replace ES 5 with Student Scorecard data
 2. ES6- Delete SRTK measures since their cohorts are so narrowly defined that they don’t represent Skyline College’s general student population.
 3. ES7- (a) Revise the benchmark using the formula provided by the CCCCO. (b) Check to see if that formula is consistent with what we’ve been collecting. See http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/ARCC2_0/Student-Counseling%20Ratio%20Webinar.pdf. (b) Check to see if that formula is consistent with what we’ve been collecting. (c) Add the Student Success and Support Program as a college-wide initiative. Also broaden FYE to learning communities.
 4. ES8- (a) Concern was raised as to whether “scholarships” should be included in this formula since not all recipients have financial need. (b) Raise the benchmark to the five-year average of 39% from 28%. (c) Add Sparkpoint and the Student Success and Support Program as college-wide initiatives.
 5. ES9- Add the College Success Initiative and Transfer Initiative as college-wide initiatives.

- B. FB 1-4 – see [below](#) for recommendations
 1. FB 1- (a) Continue to measure FTES even though it eventually may not factor so prominently into the district resource allocation model. (b) Unclear what to set the benchmark at; 2% seems too optimistic.
 2. FB2- Double-check whether 525 is still a widely used standard for measuring efficiency.

3. FB3- Should the fill rate be raised from 83% to 90%, which is the five-year average?
4. FB 4- Don't change the benchmark.

C. IG 2-5—see [below](#) for sub-committee recommendations

1. IG 2- (a) Increase the benchmark from 4% to 7.4%, which is the five-year average (and change the rationale accordingly). In addition, we met the 4% goal easily, along with there being many more training opportunities. (b) Add Structured Training for Online Teaching to the college-wide initiative.
2. IG 3—(a) Need to clarify the measure. Rather than just the amount raised, either divide the number awarded by the amount available, or the total amount requested by the amount available.
3. IG 4—(a) identify where that figure comes from (e.g., a three year grant—how do you determine what is recorded from year to year? Or should it only include new awards each year?); (b) once we confirm the figures, then either raise the benchmark from \$4.2 million to \$7.8 million, which is the five year average, or take out the high and low amounts and determine an average from the remaining three—in this case \$7 million,
4. IG 5- (a) Add the Classified Council funds, and PEDAC/ CCTL if they receive funds. (b) Need to determine what the formula will be, especially since 1% is negotiated into the contract and therefore a given.

D. New additions under consideration (Aaron and Karen)

1. retention and success in distance learning courses
2. subsequent success from one level below transfer to transfer level courses within a three year time frame in English and Mathematics
3. # of degrees issued
4. # of certificates awarded
5. # of transferring students
6. # of international students
7. % of programs meeting their success and retention benchmarks (depends on what we find out at the accreditation conference)
8. retention, persistence and success for underrepresented groups compared to the general student population (something equity related)

VI. Proposal to approve the new sub-descriptor to the Lifelong Wellness ISLO – approved unanimously

Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of lifelong wellness through physical fitness and personal development. Lifelong wellness includes the ability to:

- demonstrate an understanding of physical fitness and its role in lifelong wellness.
- take personal responsibility for identifying ~~psycho-social~~ **personal** needs, determining resources, and accessing appropriate services for academic success.
- **(proposed addition that was assessed in the pilot) exhibit a growth mindset, such as seeing effort as a path to mastery, persisting in the face of setbacks, embracing challenges, and learning from constructive criticism.**

VII. Please designate the following Mondays (the 4th Mondays of the month), 2-3:30, for SLOAC Steering/ IE Committee meeting: February 23 (Campus Climate Survey Results Town Hall), March 30*, April 27. The meeting with an asterisk beside it is not on the usual fourth Monday.

BALANCED SCORECARD MEASURES	MEMBERS
ES 1-4	1) Kristina Brower 2) Arthur Takayama
ES 6-10	1) Lorraine DeMello 2) Jacquie Escobar 3) Alice Erskine 4) Nichole Palmer
IS 1-3	1) Dennis Wolbers 2) Lucia Lachmayr 3) Steve Aurilio 4) Michael Bishow
FB 1-4	1) Evan Leach 2) Karen Wong 3) Jan Fosberg
IG 1-5	1) Nick Kapp 2) Sarita Santos 3) Alana Utsumi

ES 6- 10 (Lorraine, Jacquie, Alice & Nichole)

Outcomes Measure	<p>Questions to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How well are we performing over time? 2) Is the Goal Value an appropriate value? Should it be increased? Decreased? 3) Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? Should we use a different measure? 4) Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area?
ES6 Students Right to Know	<p>SRTK refers to a Federally-mandated public disclosure of a college's Completion Rate and Transfer Rate. The goal is based on the state average for STRKS Completion in a given year. The current goal is 25%.</p> <p>For the years F08 – Spring 2011, we fell to 20%. For the year F09 – S12, we fell to 17%.</p> <p>Those years there were several changes that could have impacted our reaching our performance:</p> <p>Transfer – changes to admissions policies</p> <p>Degree – changes to Associate Degree requirements (ie. English and Mathematics)???</p> <p>25% seems appropriate.</p>
ES7 Student to Counselor Ratio	<p>Formula: The number of counselors per credit student enrolled in fall and spring. All full and part-time general counseling are included – no special program faculty such as DSPS and EOPS are included.</p> <p>The current goal is 900:1.</p> <p>Thoughts:</p> <p>What is the Academic Senate for California Community College changes?</p> <p>Arthur's thoughts: It appears that while our " student success ratings" for Retention, Persistence, overall Success and Basic Skills are acceptable, the "Counselor/Student ratio" is unacceptable. On first impression, the notion is that the role of the counselors is somewhat marginalized by the results. Obviously, this is not the situation. Thus, the "ration" is not indicative of the role of the counselors. I'm assuming the misrepresentation of the counselors is due to the implementation of our very effective on-line counseling website. This would then argue for a change in how we represent the impact of counselors in the performance of</p>

	<p>our students. I suppose one could incorporate the number of students that utilize the on-line counseling with the data on counselor face to face time with students. Perhaps, a tally of hours of engagement by the student with counseling services?</p>
<p>ES8 FA Recipient -</p>	<p>The number of student who received financial aid including: BOGG fee waivers, Pell Grants, Scholarships Benchmark</p> <p>No recommended changes – goal has been reached for the last 5 years.</p> <p>Outcome Measure Goal: This goal for this outcome measure was originally based on an average from the previous five years. The current goal is 28%.</p> <p><i>Notes: "Future outcome measure goal setting may tie enrollment trends (including demographic segments) to recipient rate to better identify expected outcome and strength the college goal."</i></p> <p><i>Goal needs to be reassessed given increase in student enrollment.</i></p>
<p>ES9 Student Satisfaction Overall Rating</p>	<p>Formula: The percentage of students who selected "Very Satisfied, "Satisfied" or "Somewhat Satisfied" on the question(s) from the student climate survey which asks about overall satisfaction with the college.</p> <p>College-Wide Initiatives Link: Consider adding CSI, Transfer Initiative.</p> <p><i>Not enough data is being collected to determine progress towards reaching this goal.</i></p>
<p>ES10 Community Events</p>	<p>The total number of community events and activities open to the public that promote the college.</p> <p>Outcome Measure Goal: The goal for this outcome measure was set at 60 events in 2007/2008 after careful review of previous five years performance.</p> <p>Thoughts:</p> <p>Rationale for Outcome Measure Goal: The goal for this outcome measure reflects the minimum number of regularly offered events required to reach a critical mass of community members in a single year.</p> <p>Initial thought was to assess the quality of the events being provided and the success of such events, although this might be difficult to do.</p> <p>Goal needs to be evaluated – Check with Linda B. for data</p>

FB01- 4 (Evan, Karen)

FBO1: Community supported/Basic aid means no state apportionment, FTES growth less of a factor in District apportionment;

Align with new apportionment factors, esp. “demonstrated need”

Should still keep track since “demonstrated need” might include growth.

FBO2: Correlate Load with Success/Retention/Persistence?

FBO3: Raise goal rate to reflect increased 5-year average (91% from 2008-2013)?

Do overfilled classes balance out underfilled classes? Should they?

FBO4: Update goal to reflect increased five-year average (5.38% from 2008-2013)?

IG 1-5 (Alana, Nick, Sarita)

How well are we performing over time?	Is the Goal value an appropriate value? Should it be increased? Decreased?	Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? Should we use a different measure?	Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area?
IG 1	varies	Based on 05/06 numbers, seems like it should be updated	Perhaps a comparison of the # of new courses vs. the # of existing courses, leaving a percentage. That takes into consideration banked or deleted courses, which some of the “new” courses are replacing.
IG 2	Out-performed goals every year	05/06 numbers, definitely outdated, considering all of the advances that have been made. Since we have meet the goal for the past 5 years we should increase it.	Should also include the number of faculty that use web-enhanced instruction and/or course-management technology in typical on-site courses.
IG 3	Did not reach goals most years. Why? Lack of fundraising (IF RAISED FUNDS), or lack of knowledge, lack of applications? (IF GRANTED FUNDS)	If that is what we have available, we should strive to reach that goal. We’ve come close...	If it’s RAISED, this amount should be indexed to inflation annually. If GRANTED, why is it not reaching goal? Is the process to apply too difficult?
<p>SOME CONFUSION: Is the amount on the scorecard the amount GRANTED/GIVEN OUT, or the amount RAISED at the President’s Breakfast?</p>			

IG 4

We appear to have out-performed our goal every year

Looks like it's a low goal and should probably be increased (established in **05/06**)

Perhaps the goal should be a percentage; i.e. 5% of the general budget

IG 5

Appears to be fairly consistent (not sure what 1% is...)

Based on a percentage seems like a better idea than a set amount from 10 years ago.

Classified Staff development is not included and should be at this time.

