



IR Council Meeting

June 21, 2006 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
District Office, Maricopa Conference Room

Members Present

Tracy Salter, Linda Hughes, Linda Hawbaker, Jeff Simonson, Beth Hunt-Larson, Matt Ashcraft, Susan Starrfield, Amber Daines, Dan Huston, Jan Binder, Damita Kaloostian, Mary Day, Christina Santa Cruz, Ajit Kelkar, Rene Willekens, David (Rio), Suzanne Martin, Georgia Gudykunst, James Waugh, David Sweeley

Colleges not represented: GW, PV.

Guests: Virginia Cantu and Robert Peterson, District Curriculum Office

Brio Tips. Tracy Salter

Setting Variable Limits, Customizing Limits.

A variable limit is a limit in query section only when query is processed. When the query has run, you will be prompted to select or enter limit values and complete the constraint. The Limit item is displayed with a V (1) beside the variable name. If you set other items to variable limits, you will see a V (2) beside the second variable, V (3) beside the third variable, etc.

Customizing Limits. You can use the Customize Limit dialog box to enable you to control features your end user can use through setting limits. Caution: Do not select "Show Values" – this will be extremely slow. (See handout for setting both types of limits, Brio training folder, server.)

Methods. Tracy pointed out 6 methods and their use in looking at beginning of term GPA. (See handout for details, Brio training folder, server.) Caution: Do NOT use Method 3 unless you have <10,000 rows.

Welcome to Guests: Virginia Cantu, District -Curriculum Office

I. Legislative Request. Georgia, Mary, Linda and Virginia.

The recent legislative request -- for a breakdown of enrollments for courses that are in any way required for a program/award -- gave us an opportunity to begin to look at this data for the first time as system. This has been an opportunity to learn about just some of the complexity of the program design process beginning with faculty at individual colleges to the district curriculum process, and the consistencies/some lack of consistencies across colleges. Linda said that she and Virginia Cantu engaged in a lot of work to identify the courses, the data on how are defined or linked to programs and awards, which courses are developmental and are parts of programs, courses that transfer/or not, etc.

IR Council Meeting

June 21, 2006 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
District Office, Maricopa Conference Room

The group greatly appreciated that Virginia was here today to share some of the complexity of the curriculum processes. The group was particularly interested in the implications of our college/system processes for the student, for the college, and system and budget. Some questions were raised. Are decisions made at college level or district wide? In what ways can we help to support or contribute to the process? How do we begin to look at our system systemically and the interconnections, and the impacts of colleges doing things inconsistently?

Here are some examples. As we move toward a self-serve system, inconsistencies in college processes may lead to confusion for students as they look at which/how courses are parts of programs. Some colleges may specify the prerequisite for a course required in a program; some may not. If the prerequisite information is not clearly noted the student may end up surprised that the program may actually take longer to complete.

The legislature (some) has sought this year to eliminate funding for key educational programs at the CCs: developmental education, ESL, ABE/GED, Skills Centers). This is potentially a 10% cut in budget in future years, even though the legislature this year did not enact language to stop funding these areas. PE courses are probably not a real concern. We need to look at information, and be very cognizant of the implications for students, colleges, system and our budget from the state. And we need to anticipate proactively for next year.

Virginia explained that this is college derived process as it seeks to develop program or courses for a program. At the front end: faculty drive and design programs at the campus. At the back end, there is the outcome of how the students completed and applied the courses to their programs. A misalignment can exist between these. Virginia noted that we need to get to a place where we are clear by what we mean by courses linked to program, etc. and we need to raise the issues to the instructional councils.

Mary noted implications for financial aid. A student has to declare they are working toward a degree or certificate, and FA will pay 30 hours of developmental education courses (excluding ESL), and subject to satisfactory academic progress. If a student needs ESL help, they are not able to use FA for this purpose.

There are some inconsistencies observed. For example, Eng 071 is named in a program. MAT061 is not named in a program. Yet both are prerequisites. This is a design issue. And if a college does not list every prerequisite for courses in a program, then this impacts the student negatively. They may be surprised that their program is actually longer than they anticipated, because of hidden prerequisites. Note: very few programs carry below 100 level courses

Some courses are considered equivalent to others. Nowhere do we have documented that some courses are equivalent... so we are unable to count them, as counting toward a program/award for the legislature or other groups. There is also the issue of modules.

Virginia gave the example of MAT298, a new offering by SMC. This is a special need but it is not really a course with 200 level work. It is actually a developmental level math course. Susan

IR Council Meeting

June 21, 2006 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
District Office, Maricopa Conference Room

noted that this course is NOT counted in a program. Yet, if we were pulling all 200 courses into a report, we would not know that this is a dev. ed. course, not an advanced course.

Linda and Virginia worked closely to locate data using the degree audit system (MAPS). They set up a hierarchy – as to where a course should be categorized (ex. certificate, degree). The group asked for definitions (ex. “wildcard”) and that these are made available on web.

Rene asked whether it is 10% of our budget or 10% of the state aid from the legislature. Mary suggested the impact either way would be significant if the legislature in a future year were to eliminate funding; we would not have the funds to provide programs such as ESL, etc. While the legislature (some) attempted to cut funding to a number of programs (ex. Dev. Ed., ESL, ABE/GED, Skills Centers), they were not able pass language to this effect this year. Georgia suggested that these cut back issues will probably come back again, and that we need to be proactive in pointing out implications of issues and choices.

In short, to report data by courses is very do-able. To report courses by program is problematic, given the types of issues mentioned above.

Mary raised the key question: How do we address the political agenda of the legislature (some wish to get ride of developmental education, ESL, GED and related programs) versus what is good educational practice (what is good and needed for benefit of students)? Also, should we share with VP’s of Administrative Services (because they have to deal with budget)? And the VP’s of Student Affairs (because some of their programs and services would be impacted)? Virginia noted the program design issue goes to the VPs of Academic Affairs.

Recommendation:

- That Virginia, Linda, Georgia and Mary draft a document (matrix) of issues
- That the program design issue goes to the VPs of Academic Affairs, thus the lead in addressing the issues identified (in the document to be drafted)
- That the other VP councils (Administrative Services and Student Affairs) also should be made aware of the issues, as there are system impacts
- That the VP’s of Academic Affairs provide report backs on status of issues to CEC.

A. New Legislative Request. Linda and Georgia

Linda noted they are requesting an annual report to the Governor, detailing all credit and noncredit course offerings. This includes course number, title, short description and enrollments for the past 3 years (and FTSE for the credit courses). They also seek tuition and fees for every credit and noncredit course, also the % of students achieving the credits (completion rates), and some information on which courses are offered new each year (or not). The AZ CCs have been asked to respond with what they expect to provide in October.

We need the colleges help as usual with the Noncredit Course enrollments. We will send you a template, since the legislature is asking for more information this year. When our system decides by mid July to what extent we will respond, we’ll send you a template.

IR Council Meeting

June 21, 2006 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
District Office, Maricopa Conference Room

(Then when we get the info. back from you, IE Office will need to tie to fees data to noncredit enrollments, if this is the route Maricopa chooses.)

Georgia noted that Gaye Murphy has asked our Government Relations Office and our consultant to advise on what would be a reasonable response from us (ex. provide some of info.). This request is in effect an addendum to the currently required report to the Governor in which the colleges and DO provide a narrative about their college for the prior year and the Budget and IE Offices provide some statistical information. Georgia proposed that, since this will be an annual report, that we report the information as addendum (or appendix) to the current Annual Report (brief narrative and stats on each college and district), provide annual data (one year), and keep abbreviated as possible (for ex., provide high level summary of the number of credit offerings vs. noncredit, enrollments, top 25 [50] courses, the tuition, the range of fees for labs, for non labs, for specialized, etc.). The extent of reporting also will depend on the recommendations from govt. relations/consultant. We will advise on their proposed strategy.

II. Core Indicator Review for Reporting to Board/CEC. Georgia and Rene'

Georgia noted the IE Office currently provides an Indicator Report to the Board and the CEC, which includes a number of indicators on the MCCCD system as a whole. We include a few of the HLC indicators as well as some others. Georgia provided a matrix of the various indicators we report in some way as a system, as a starting point for discussion. The matrix notes the perspective (ex. student, financial), the strategic direction (ex. access, learning, workforce) that seem to which the indicators seem to link. The request is for the IR Council to make recommendations on the core indicators to report on a systemic and annual basis, focusing on the student (customer) indicators. Feedback on financial as well other indicators, however, are welcome. Criteria? Ideally we would include those that would be core to our mission/strategic directions, have national benchmarks, that can be "grouped" (ex. performance after transfer, core academic performance,), and relatively easy to understand. There may also be other indicators that are core, but we may not have or be able to access the data for October, but we could provide a placeholder for these.

Based on Council input, we would recommend that the core indicators consist of items "1" to "X" for the report to the Board/CEC in October. We would need to meet more than today to derive a priority list. We would then like to incorporate these into a dashboard on the web – on the way to developing a Balanced Scorecard approach to system effectiveness. HR is being asked to recommend a few HR indicators, Budget Office for a few financial measures, and then involving some groups to see if we might be able to identify some internal processes over time. These four – student, financial, employee/org., and internal processes – comprise the basic perspective of the balanced scorecard, to look at a system from multi-perspectives.

The group suggested some indicators to consider core. Mary suggested successful completion in the core academic areas (ex. math, English), persistence from one fall to the next, and performance after transfer. Georgia suggested workforce indicators. Susan suggested we include any indicators that we report both to HLC and IPEDs. Mary noted that we need to acknowledge the RTK, and address key questions such as who comes to CC, who stays, who completes...based on behavior, possibly consider which cohorts.

IR Council Meeting

June 21, 2006 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
District Office, Maricopa Conference Room

Rene' asked for volunteers to go through the matrix, see if there are other indicators to consider, and then review the link to mission/strategic directions to come up with a short list. Volunteers included: Susan, Jan, Jim, Suzanne and Georgia. They will meet June 27, and report back at the next IR Council meeting.

College Reports. Jan Binder

Jan reported that 4 offices are helping to develop the environmental scans - PC, EM, SM and district IE Office. Damita is putting together the drafts and then will redistribute to the group for review and final edits.

IR Council Retreat. Rene'

Rene' noted that several requests have come in, asking that the IR Council consider holding a retreat in July or August, rather than September. Topics to address include: Core indicators and Balanced Scorecard, DW funding for collaboratively funding national benchmark projects, "5 minutes of fame per college," etc. The group decided to hold a Retreat on July 12, from 9:15 AM – end of day at RIO. Rene' will send agenda. It is important on the national projects that we first look at all the surveys that we already employ/how we use the information, etc. Georgia will send out a matrix for each college to complete (director or designee).

Higher Education Directory. IE Office

Georgia asked each college to review their administrator information to be updated for the Higher Education Directory. After you receive tuition/fees information to be provided shortly by the Budget Office, please mail back directly to: Higher Education Publications, Inc. (Attn: Jodi) this coming week, by June 30. (See form provided to each college.)

Meeting Adjourned.

Next Meeting:

IRC Retreat, Wednesday, July 12, from 9:15 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at Rio Salado College, Room 515