



IR Council Meeting
September 21, 2011
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Rio Conference Center

Members Present

Andrea Archer - SMCC
Keith Cantor - DO
John Catapano – DO
Sohee Chung - SMCC
Mary Day - CGCC
Christina Flora - RSC

Linda Hughes - SCC
Damita Kaloostian - SMCC
Kristin Kennedy - RS
Janet Krause - DO
Kerry Mitchell - EMCC
Tracy Salter - DO

Donna Silber - DO
Alka Arora Singh - GCC
John Snelling - PVCC
David Sweeley - RSC
Jim Waugh - GCC
Genevieve Winters - RSC

Guests

Bill Schooling from the Office of Employment and Population Statistics, Arizona Department of Administration.

Introductions

Donna Silber noted that we had a new member, Kristin Kennedy from Rio Salado. The Council members introduced themselves to the group with their names and colleges.

IR Council Meeting Schedule for 2012

Janet Krause indicated that the IR Council meetings are typically scheduled for the third Wednesday of each month. A hand-out of the proposed IR Council meeting dates for 2012 was provided. Janet indicated that the only date that appears to be problematic is the November meeting which would be the Wednesday immediately preceding Thanksgiving. Many Council members may schedule vacation time on that date. Janet requested feedback from Council members.

Capital Planning Meeting

Several IR Directors participated in the Capital Planning Meeting with Debbie Thompson and Lionel Diaz on September 7th at the District Office. A copy of the agenda for this meeting was shared with the Council. Donna Silber requested that those members who attended the meeting share their comments with the rest of the IR Council. The charge for the Capital Planning Committee is to look at long-range strategic plans and needs for the district. In May, Thomas Frey, a futurist, came to speak to the District planning committees. He talked about the trend toward distance education.

Alka Aurora Singh commented that we should not only look at online and distance learning in the future, but also learning communities and other aspects of education that show promise to increase student success. Alka indicated she had forwarded a relevant article to the District Institutional Effectiveness Office to share with the group. (Note: Subsequent to the meeting, the article was posted to the shared drive in the following folder: IR Council\Capital Planning\Educause - Making the Case for Space). She suggested that the Council might resurrect the Environmental Scan process and concentrate that effort on these needs. She felt this might be an appropriate niche for the E-Scan. John Snelling pointed out that FTSE is growing because of online and hybrid courses. Are students still going to want this in 5 to 10

years? He feels that education needs to move from a position where we are responding to forces to one in which we are being proactive and anticipating needs.

The planning committees will be looking to the IR Council to provide assistance regarding in-seat and online enrollment predictions into the next 5 to 10 years and beyond, to as far as 2025. How will education look in 2025 and how does the District prepare? The Capital Planning Committee is looking for one person from the IR Council to serve as a delegate to that committee. In addition, the Capital Planning Committee will be working with the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) and will likely need an IR Council volunteer to serve as a liaison with that group as well.

Census Data Presentation by Guest Speaker, Bill Schooling

John Catapano arranged for and introduced the guest speaker, Bill Schooling from the Office of Employment and Population Statistics, Arizona Department of Administration. Bill provided an informative session on population data and demographics. He reminded the Council that one must always make sure the data make sense before using them, and then illustrated this point with specific examples. He also promised to provide the Council with Excel pivot tables with population pyramids. (Note: Subsequent to the meeting, John Catapano received and posted the population pyramid pivots to the IR Shared drive in a folder called "Population Pyramids".)

When John Snelling asked about the methodology for population projections, Bill indicated that local projections were moving to a cohort component model that will clearly state assumptions and provide high, medium and low projections for the population. The cohort component model uses data from a number of sources, including births, deaths, housing, Social Security Administration information, school data sets, Motor Vehicle Department data, voter registrations, etc. The new projections will be released in December and Bill recommends that IR Council members wait to use the new data, if at all possible.

Break

The Council took a 15 minute break from 10:25 to 10:40.

Gainful Employment

At the meeting on August 17, the IR Council made four recommendations on the Gainful Employment Program cost methodology. However, the Council wanted input from the Financial Aid (FA) Council. As representatives to the FA Council, Donna Silber and Damita Kaloostian presented the IR Council recommendations to the FA Council at their meeting on September 9th. The FA Council provided feedback on these recommendations. Donna provided a hand-out which outlined the recommendations from the FA Council.

The IR Council discussed the Gainful Employment recommendations in light of the feedback from the FA Council and various members of the IR Council. After much discussion, the IR Council made the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1:

The Council decided that it is in the best interests of the District to provide the minimum true "program" costs, essentially providing cost estimates only for the course work or credits specifically required for a particular program. To provide more than the minimum creates additional methodology issues, confusion and the potential to significantly overstate program costs. The Council agreed to provide direct program costs with no estimated costs for pre-requisite courses or developmental course work. This figure should

be provided with the disclaimer that there may be additional costs for other courses required prior to commencing the program.

Recommendation 2:

The IR Council agreed with the suggestion from the FA Council that the district use an average cost for course options. For example, if a program allows students to select a biology course or a chemistry course to meet the requirements of the program, the cost estimate will average the costs of these two courses.

Recommendation 3:

This recommendation addresses the issues associated with the costs for other program requirements such as vaccinations, physical exams, specific tools, etc. Costs for these items may vary widely depending on the individual's specific circumstances, the vendors used to purchase these items, etc. Determining an average cost estimate would be extremely difficult across one college, much less the entire district, because it would be very difficult to determine all the possible costs for any particular item such as a vaccination. The disclosure requirements also prohibit the use of a price range; a specific price must be listed. The Council also considered using maximum prices to keep the estimates realistic. These estimates could have a footnote, reading something similar to "Typical costs should not exceed this amount." However, quoting maximum prices may make programs look more cost prohibitive than they really are. Finally, the IR Council members did not know what extraneous costs may be required by the various programs.

The IR Council agreed this group does not have enough information to make this decision, and further agreed that Council members are not the appropriate individuals to make this decision. The Council suggested that this particular item be addressed by the Occupational Deans at their next meeting. They would be in a position to know 1) what items are actually required for each program, and 2) the typical costs associated with those required items. Once this information is gathered from each college, it may be easier to determine an appropriate cost estimate for the District as a whole.

As a result, no decision was made by the IR Council on this recommendation. The IR Council will request that the Compliance Group refer this item to the Occupational Deans. The IR Council suggested that, in the interest of time, an email be sent to the Occupational Deans prior to their meeting so that they can bring this information with them and the recommendation can be discussed by the deans at their next meeting.

Recommendation 4:

The IR Council and the FA Council agree that personal expenses such as room and board, transportation and other living expenses should be excluded from these disclosures.

(Note: Subsequent to the meeting, Donna Silber met with Andrea Buehman concerning these recommendations. Andrea clarified that it was not the IR Council's responsibility to create the cost estimates for the additional costs outlined in Recommendation 3. Andrea will work with the Occupational Deans and the Compliance Committee to determine the appropriate costs disclosures for these items.)

Price of Attendance Disclosure Methodology

The Council agreed it would be appropriate to use the same methodology recommendations for the Price of Attendance disclosure methodology as the Gainful Employment Program cost disclosures. Mary Day

asked when the Department of Education (DOE) was going to release the template and methodology requirements for reporting Gainful Employment. Donna Silber indicated that this information is supposed to be released on October 1st. Donna's request to the DOE for further information went unanswered. The Financial Aid offices are likely to be the first notified when this information is made available. Donna will make this an action item and will let IR Council members know when the information is released.

Job Placement Update

At the last meeting, the IR Council agreed to collect surveys from other institutions that might provide some ideas for core survey items that could be added to the college surveys to gather job placement information from graduates and completers. Damita Kaloostian thanked all who forwarded surveys to her. She had originally planned to create a matrix, but found that process to be very difficult because the surveys were very complicated, sometimes very long, and labeled by a number of different names (alumni surveys, graduating senior surveys, etc.). She suggested that the council may want to address the issue of creating survey items in one of two ways: create a sub-committee or put sufficient time on the next agenda to break into groups to work on this project. The Council decided to address this issue as a group at the next meeting.

Damita suggested that the Council may want to address the issue from the perspective of what we need, what we have or could get, and what questions would address the issues/information for which there is not another source. The Council needs to understand the scope and purpose of these surveys from both a workforce and compliance perspective. Finally, the survey would need to be pared down to a core of essential questions which are consistent with the needs and practices at each college. The Council will require a resolution before the next meeting of what is needed from these survey items so that the Council can start working on them immediately.

Net Price Calculator Update

Donna Silber announced that all the net price calculators are now complete. The webmasters and marketing departments at each college have them and are working to get them posted on the college websites. The calculators should be posted by the end of the month. The official deadline is October 29th and the college url's must be submitted at part of the IPEDS report. Donna requested that the Council members check their net price calculators. Donna reminded the Council that the Skill Centers and the colleges use different methodology. The Skill Centers use their largest program while the colleges use the cohort of all students receiving aid.

College Sharing

Alka Aurora Singh announced that Glendale is sharing their CCSSE results with their college leadership. This is the first time they have administered the survey so there is a lot of interest. They are also getting ready to implement the SENSE and have been receiving some push back from faculty. Others indicated they are having the same experience. John Snelling requested a schedule of the ongoing surveys to incorporate in a long-term calendar. Damita Kaloostian and Andrea Archer indicated that South Mountain had created one that they will send out.

Damita shared that MCCCDC may have an opportunity to send a team of 3 to 5 individuals to the SENSE workshop in Santa Fe on April 1 and 2, 2012 at a cost of \$7000 plus travel costs. Damita indicated that in an email to the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Maria Harper-Marinick said there may be some funding available from the District to help with these expenses. This workshop is the same time frame as the HLC Conference, and AZ AIR is also at the end of March.

Damita asked if anyone knew anything about the new SUN numbers. These are unique course numbers. Andrea Archer also wanted to know if IR Council members will have access to these numbers. Tracy Salter stated that she doesn't know if the numbers are on SIS yet and she is not aware of any reporting requirements related to the new course numbers. She indicated, however, they are designed to help students know which courses transfer and are equivalent.

Handouts

- Proposed IR Council meeting dates for 2012
- Agenda and timeline from the Capital Planning Meeting on September 7, 2011
- Copy of emails discussing the Gainful Employment Program cost methodology
- Handouts from the guest speaker
 - Table: Place of Work of Workers during the Census Week by Mean of Transportation to Work: 1970
 - Copies of Power Point slides from presentation

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Wednesday, October 19 at the Rio Conference Center from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.