

Minutes

Date: April 12, 2011 Time: 2:30 p.m. Location: Toyon Room

Attending:

Mark Anderson, Judy Baker, Jerry Cellilo, Dan Dishno, Liane Freeman, Al Guzman, Kurt Hueg, Akemi Ishikawa, Gay Krause, Rick Kuhn, Elaine Kuo, Allison Lenkeit-Meezan, John Mummert, Karen Oeh, Beckie Urrutia-Lopez, Bonny Wheeler, Antonia Zavala

Summary

Items	Notes
1. Approval of 3/8/11 Minutes	Meeting Minutes Approved
2. Perkins Funding Discussion & Prioritizati	on See Discussion Detail
3. Metrics	See Discussion Detail
4. Next Meeting	See Discussion Detail

Discussion Detail

- 1. Approval of 3/8/11 Minutes See Summary
- 2. Perkins Funding Discussion & Prioritization Workforce Workgroup (WWG)
 - a. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCO) has yet to release the allocation amount for the 2011-2012 fiscal year. It has been advised that the college base its figures on a budget of approximately 25% less than the current fiscal year's budget. Based on this new amount, \$191,479.00, divisions were presented with their new allocation totals. It was proposed that each division look at the allocations and determine if they would like to reallocate funding among their programs. If divisions would like to make any changes, they need to be submitted to Akemi Ishikawa by Monday, April 18th. There was concern raised over the potential redistribution of funds. A request was made for any radical changes in allocation requests to be recorded and reported back to WWG before finalization. It was suggested that the entire college should follow suit and post a public record of how funds are allocated and spent.
 - b. There may be a remainder of unspent funds, approximately \$20,000, in the current fiscal year. It was proposed that equipment for the Biological & Health Sciences Division be purchased with these funds to help address the lack of funds for equipment in the next fiscal year. A motion was made and it was passed unanimously.
 - c. It was stated that for the remainder of this fiscal year, programs would be able to expend their funds in Account (Object) Codes other than what was originally requested in their Budget Application Worksheet.
 - d. A change in the Prioritization process was recommended. For 2012-2013, WWG would discuss prioritizing in the fall with a draft Prioritization worksheet with accompanying narrative describing use of funds submitted by programs. In the winter, program requests would get finalized. Programs would then submit completed, final application forms in

the spring. This process should reduce any duplication of effort and any need for resubmission of forms in the future.

3. Metrics - Elaine Kuo

a. With the assistance of College Researcher, Elaine Kuo, some draft metrics and targets have been developed to help guide WWG in the formation of their metrics and to generate discussion. Workforce metrics are limited, and are based on what is known as reliable data this year. Concerns were raised around meeting the targets as listed in the handout and how the Accrediting Commission would view any shortfall. For now, it was advised to assume no change to the budget with regards to the metrics and target figures provided. The college is expected to produce firm numbers for the Accrediting Commission, but the numbers are just a starting point. They are flexible. Several unknowns, in particular, budget cuts, will be taken into consideration, and changes to the figures can be made accordingly. Once hard data becomes available, amendments will be made. The Strategic Master Plan will be updated annually to adjust for these changes. Still, there was concern about measuring student success. How do we define success? ARCC's (Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges) definition is based on A, B, C and Credit/Pass. Math and English requirements can create a "bottle neck" in completion of certificates. We should be encouraging students to complete their certificates to help meet our targets. We need to identify specific strategies for Workforce to help our students succeed. How do we capture students who do not complete a course? What other data can we access to measure success? Are we ok with targets based on our current budget? What is realistic? A recommendation Accreditation Self was made to ao to the Study web http://www.foothill.edu/president/2011.php to see if Workforce can meet its targets or if they need to be changed. This will help determine realistic and unrealistic goals.

4. Next Meeting - WWG

- a. Metrics: Have a final draft prepared, for approval by PaRC and posting to the college web site.
- b. Certificates: Tracking, transcripting, etc.
- c. DegreeWorks: Refresher/Update

Handouts:

- Meeting Minutes 3/8/11 (DRAFT)
- Perkins Prioritization Budget Planning FY 2011-2012 (DRAFT)
- Setting goals, metrics and targets for Educational & Strategic Master Plan (DRAFT)

Next Workforce Workgroup meeting: Tuesday, May 10, 2011, 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., Toyon Room