Steve wants to put on the record appreciation for Inge’s work in putting together data for this group in spite of her high work load. Jim agreed.

I. Approval of meeting minutes of 3.1.13 and 3.8.13

3.1.13 minutes approved. (Henderson/Juarez; M/S) . 3.8.13 minutes approved (Henderson/Crumley; M/S) – one abstention.

II. Discuss college marketing efforts with Fred Chow

Steve welcomed Fred Chow and Scott Ludwig. Fred shared that marketing efforts are focused on the college overall. A few years ago we revamped our logo and colors. Our major vehicles for marketing are the schedule, catalog, web, bus ads, some cable TV. We don’t generally market for specific programs.

Scott shared that we approach marketing at the macro level. We put out over 80,000 class schedules for Spring semester. We send out to targeted zip codes where most of our students come from. This is where our efforts will be most successful. We create flyers and send them out through Comcast Uverse to 18,000 households, newspaper ads focused on parents and SJSU Spartan daily for reverse transfer students, community outreach at Oktoberfest which reaches 40,000 people. 25 bus tail ads on VTA buses which cost $6000. DeAnza is spending $50,000 on
bus ads alone. A senior mailer is going to 65,000 homes of high school students (seniors) and their parents. Internal marketing includes Facebook with 3000 users during any single week, sandwich boards, Twitter with 371 followers, Instagram, redesign of parking permits to market the college.

Scott encourages programs to keep their department web page updated. The Omni update training has been provided and continues to be provided. People who come to our home page are on that page for only about 25-30 seconds before they move on to program sites and other pages.

Scott’s team can create graphics for programs and put on Facebook and flyers if requested. There aren’t a lot of resources, so capacity is limited, but they make the effort to serve everyone.

Steve asked why our marketing funding is so low compared to DeAnza. We have $20,000 total for all marketing while DeAnza has $60,000 for bus ads alone. Scott responded that Land Corp has given funding in the past, but not this year. He appreciates the support of college committees in recognizing the importance of marketing. Fred added that Land Corp did provide funds in the past, but because they are currently funding operations (backfilling the current deficit), this funding is not being provided currently. Jim expressed that it seems that this time is critical for us to be adding to our marketing budget. Mission College’s budget is much less than ours.

Max added that there are 6 programs that currently need help. He feels that these 6 programs are having difficulty getting enrollment. These programs have indicated that they have had trouble getting responses from marketing for assistance. Scott shared that there is some internal marketing for some of these programs. He shared that marketing alone may not be the solution to revitalizing the programs. Jim asked whether any of the programs have contacted Scott for help. Scott responded that he is not aware of failing to respond to any messages. He would like to know if anyone feels that they haven’t been responded to and they should bring that information to him.

Stephanie expressed that we need to be extremely cautious about accepting any accusations from programs that the marketing program is not responsive. Unless we have specific information about a communication that was not responded to, we should not assume that the marketing team did not do their part in responding to program requests. Steve agreed that we need to document any claims that may be included in a report to the Senate. Kaei expressed that she has always found marketing to be responsive and helpful. Ann Marie expressed that she has had good experiences with marketing. Sometimes, she has been told that there isn’t enough funding, but she has had a positive experience.
Jim expressed that any claims by programs that marketing has not been responsive to them have to be filtered and are not a productive aspect of our work moving forward in the work groups.

Max asked where students see the digital signage. Scott responded that they are found in multiple buildings across campus such as Campus Center, Fox, A&R, AAS, Math/Science, and other buildings. Max asked if there is a significant cost to marketing programs on this digital signage. Scott responded that the cost is in labor in creating the graphics and then in managing the digital signage. Posting the information on social media is free.

Ann Marie asked whether we should be recommending any specific kind of marketing. Scott responded that if he is contacted, his team can create graphics and post them on social media and digital signage. The timeline for production is about a couple of weeks. We can also post things on iTunes University. We have Carl Jones, Donna Nguyen (part time), and student worker Stella Lister who work on the graphics. If graphics are created, programs could share these with their professional organizations, if desired.

Max asked if we can still use the Class Schedule to put ads in. Scott responded that we have reduced the number of pages in the schedule to reduce costs, but there is still some room for ads. It is currently too late to submit ads for the Fall Schedule. There is potential that we will no longer print schedules and use only online schedules in the future. It is difficult for us to measure the effectiveness of our marketing efforts. We can track users online, but this is the limit of our ability to measure.

Scott’s team has done surveys in the past and half the students say they want to get information about the college online and half say they want print materials. Marketing is a long term activity. You have to keep a constant budget to constantly market the college. He is attempting “content marketing” in which we highlight the positive effects of what we do. We have alumni profiles on the website. We are highlighting performances, guest lectures, alumni visits.

Ann Marie shared that we don’t have an alumni association. She shared that 75% of her students say they learn about her ESL program through a family member or friend. Sometimes, word of mouth is the most powerful method. Perhaps we could develop an alumni association. Scott responded that they are designing alumni pages, but there is such limited time and staff.

Fred expressed that the alumni page with the profiles took a lot of time to put together and it hasn’t been updated since it was put together. Moving forward, we would like to do profiles of faculty as well. Jim asked if Fred is aware of any college programs that are doing their own marketing. He responded that there are most certainly some of these activities going on. Scott shared that the Art Department has a blog. Leigh shared that English and Women’s Studies create their own flyers.

Fred added that outreach is another component of marketing. Student ambassadors who are current WVC students and return to their high schools are very effective in marketing/outreach.
Steve summarized that it appears that there are multiple avenues for us to pursue. He thanked Fred and Scott for their presentation. The group expressed amazement at how much marketing is able to get done on such a small budget.

III. Discuss cost of programs with Pat Fenton

Steve welcomed Pat. Steve introduced the topic by explaining that Pat and Jim had met to come up with a way to measure the costs of each program. He asked them to explain this method to the committee. Pat said that in preparation for this year’s budgeting exercise, he created a comparison between 2 years’ actuals and planned budgets from Fund 100 plus Fund 120 money that is lottery and Land Corp related. The comparison for each of the 6 programs we are reviewing was distributed to this committee by Stephanie in a past meeting.

Pat had Inge enter the relevant FTES and FTEF for each department and the dollar calculations. The final worksheet shows costs and revenue per program. It shows whether a program is revenue positive, revenue negative or revenue neutral. This document was sent via email from Inge. Jim put the figures on the whiteboard.

For Architecture, for 10-11, this program consumes 1.01% of all academic program costs. It generates 1.02% of the FTES. For 11-12, it consumes 1.07% of the costs and generates 1.18% of the FTES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>10-11 cost %</th>
<th>10-11 FTES generation %</th>
<th>11-12 cost %</th>
<th>11-12 FTES generation %</th>
<th>Pos/Neg/Neut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pkmgt</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMIS</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program cost is one of the 3 factors this committee used to determine accepting the programs. Steve asked Stephanie to resend Inge’s message to the group with this document attached. Kaeé expressed that Tom Sanford said that the Engineering program is bringing income to the college outside of FTES. She didn’t know exactly what that was referring to. Pat shared that some programs do fundraising that goes into the college foundation account. He has not seen any evidence that Engineering has such an account. VTEA money has not been included in Pat’s analysis. VTEA money goes to programs. We need to identify any other sources of revenue that programs are benefitting from to identify the full cost of programs. Pat can provide information on VTEA funds for the 6 programs.

Kaeé shared that the management of VTEA funding used to be carefully controlled with narrow restrictions. It then got loose and funds were used for basic operations. Now that Frank has taken over, it is being carefully managed and the funds are used for special projects.
Max asked if we can refer some faculty to Pat for budget questions. Pat can get information on other revenue sources for these 6 programs for this year. Steve thanked Pat for his discussion.

IV. Discuss Student Success Act of 2012 and state Chancellor’s Office priorities

Stephanie shared a summary document regarding new enrollment priorities and the Student Success Act of 2012. The new priority is for students who complete degrees, certificates, transfer. They will be prioritized in enrollment and funding may be tied to our rates of completion and other data points related to success. The state is unveiling a new Student Success Scorecard on April 9th which will post information on the completion rates of students at each college and other data points including persistence and wages of students who complete a certificate/degree. The state does not measure the wages of students who do not earn a certificate or degree. Therefore, when programs claim that they are successful by getting people employed but that the students don’t want or need the degree or certificate, we need to respond that this is not a measure the state uses and our funding will soon be tied to our completion rates.

Patti indicated that some of the programs under review have high unit certificates. Perhaps these are making it difficult for students to complete certificates. Steve asked why a program would create a high unit certificate. Jim responded that sometimes external bodies request a certain kind of training that requires high units. Patti shared that in Architecture, for example, there are students who want to transfer and it would be very helpful if those transfer students could also get an AA, but the Architecture AA has high units and makes it challenging to earn.

Max shared that some of these high unit programs were probably created during a different era when faculty were asked to expand and create new courses. We now need to inform these programs that we need to cut back on these high unit programs. The change of these programs to lower units would need to go through the curriculum process and be approved by the state.

Patti shared that very few community college have an Architecture program. Ours is one of the best, but we need to reduce the units on our programs to allow students to complete and then transfer.

Steve summarized that we need to communicate with programs that the past practice of growing programs through high unit certificates is no longer acceptable. Ann Marie asked details about fee-based programs. Stephanie shared that curriculum for fee-based programs does not go through the curriculum process and, depending on the discipline, there are sometimes external licensing/accrediting bodies that prescribe curriculum and qualifications for instructors.

V. Discuss work group assignments and tasks

Steve shared that the assignments he and Jim recommend for workgroups are as follows:
Cheryl agreed to work on DMIS. The group decided to split Architecture and Engineering and change some assignments.

Revised assignments:

- Pkmgt – Steve and Patti
- DMIS – Leigh and Patricia
- CA – Thuy and Cheryl
- Architecture - Max and Ann Marie
- Engineering – Gus and Stephanie
- Photo – Jim and Kae Ke Min

Next step is for each team to contact the program lead and Division Chair. Should we continue to have weekly group meetings and meet with our workgroups outside of this meeting?

Steve and Stephanie shared documents related to the Academic Senate meeting on Tuesday, 3.12.13. It appears that the Senate has discussed possibly declaring a fiscal emergency in March, April or May. Cheryl, who is on the Senate, shared that the issue was discussed and a tentative timeline was shared. Ed Maduli is going to talk about budget at the next Senate meeting. Senate will likely not decide on fiscal emergency at the next meeting, but may determine it at the following meeting. If the Senate decides that there is a fiscal emergency, the ADC will brief the Senate and recommend programs for discontinuance in September.

Jim stated that the clock has already begun ticking. We need to plan to meet with our programs soon so that we can discuss next Friday how we want to continue our work with the programs. Steve agreed. He expressed that we appear to have 2 tracks working. Some seem to want to stretch the process out. Others seem to want to move more quickly. Steve is concerned about these 2 tracks. He had intended that this group would have one year to work with programs. Cheryl shared that the only communication she has gotten in the Senate is that these decisions will be made in the fall. There is some discussion about an extended timeline if there is no fiscal emergency and this would give this committee one year.

Steve pointed out that the criteria for declaring fiscal emergency appears to be quite broad including furloughs or layoffs of employees. Cheryl responded that it was intentionally set broadly. Jim indicated that fiscal status is a district matter and so it should be a district determination whether there is a fiscal emergency. Cheryl stated that there was some discussion about reformulating the Discontinuance Policy for the future, but that we will be using the current policy for the present.
Patti and Steve expressed concern that this issue could undermine the work of this committee. Leigh shared that it is very important that we are adhering to the 11 criteria of the policy. She expressed that this group has not yet discussed the questions that Leigh and Ann Marie worked on. She reminded us that we actually don’t have one of the data points which is one of the criteria (term to term persistence compared to college averages) according to Inge. Ann Marie read from the policy that we can consider any and/or all of the criteria in our review.

We will agendize a discussion of the questions to ask programs for next meeting.

Max asked what we are supposed to be discussing with the programs. Stephanie proposed asking programs to elaborate on their intake statement. Leigh indicated that we should not revisit the past. Jim reminded the group that we have been tasked with identifying the weaknesses of the program and creating an action plan. This is what we should discuss with the programs this week:

1. Identify the weaknesses of the program
2. Begin discussing an action plan

The meeting can be an initial discussion and a reminder that we are advocates. Kaee suggested that we help the programs address their data concerns. Jim stated that that is not our responsibility. Steve expressed that we can check other data and discuss with the program leads.

We need to contact both the program lead and the Division Chair for this initial meeting.

Meeting adjourned 12:31.