1. **Welcome and Introductions** – Claudia Sullivan, Board Chair, welcomed participants to the Board retreat. A quorum of the Board was present including Pat Ashley, Ron Fox, Shawn Hogan, Roger Stokes, Claudia Sullivan and Kevin Talbert. Due notice was given.

   Administration/Staff: Cathy Kemper-Pelle, Kori Ebenhack, Leo Hirner, Laurie Roe, Curtis Sommerfeld, Lisa Stanton and Denise Nelson.

   Guests: Lois Schlegel, Facilitator

2. **Orientation –** Lois Schlegel reviewed the agenda (see file) and goals of the retreat. She also reviewed facility information, ground rules and provided an opportunity for participants to add or remove items to/from the agenda.

   Goals of the retreat – review and discuss:
   - Student data and its role in Enrollment Management
   - Impactful financial data dashboards for board use
   - Progress in achieving our Wildly Important Goals
   - Strategic enrollment management from the perspective of Student Services and Instruction

     Ms. Schlegel advised the group that items needing further attention and/or discussion, will be placed on a list for future reference. She referred to this list as the "parking lot." It was suggested to schedule another retreat this fiscal year. The new Board member filling Zone 2's seat would be appointed then and could participate.

     During the retreat, Board members provided general comments and asked questions as applicable.

3. **Student Data Discussion** – Laurie Roe, Director, Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning provided a PowerPoint presentation (see file).

   a. Enrollment data and trends – Full-Time Equivalency (FTE)
      Preliminary FTE indicates we are 3.9% down in reimbursable FTE from 2016-17. Increases in non-tuition bearing FTE offset losses in tuition bearing FTE in the State of Oregon funding formula.

      Other community colleges in the State compare as follows:
      a. Portland, Mt. Hood and LBCC lost less FTE
      b. Lane, Central Oregon, Clackamas lost more
      c. Chemeketa is similar to RCC (-3.7%)

      The FTE audit will be complete in mid-October.

Ms. Roe reviewed the following charts (see file):

a. Student headcount
b. Hispanic student enrollment
c. Program completion data by associate degrees, certificates and Oregon transfer model

b. Cohort data from Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA)
Ms. Roe reviewed the six year cohort completion outcome chart (see file).

c. Program completion data
Ms. Roe reviewed the total completed awards (associate degrees, certificates and Oregon transfer module) by academic year (2013-14 through 2017-18) (2017-18 numbers were preliminary) (see file).

d. Gateway Courses
Gateway courses are:
a. College level courses
b. High DFWI rates (students obtaining a grade of D or F, W – student withdrew or I – student received an incomplete

Gateway courses are important because they are detrimental to the student's motivation and they act as a barrier for student progress through a program. Identification of our gateway courses is important in developing student retention strategies.

In 2017-18 the top five courses with the larges DWFI rates were:

- MTH 60: Fundamentals of Algebra I
- MTH 65: Fundamentals of Algebra II
- RD 90: College Reading
- MTH 95: Intermediate Algebra
- MTH 20: Pre-algebra

President Kemper-Pelle requested receiving data not only on the top five developmental courses but also the top five college university transfer level courses.

MTH 60 and MTH 65 have appeared on the top five gateway course list each year for the past five years. MTH 95, Intermediate Algebra, appeared four times.

Dr. Talbert noted we haven't been able to make much movement on math. President Kemper-Pelle believes the best solution is to partner with K-12 and develop an alignment from high school into college. In order to do this, however, high school and college faculty would need to spend time working on this which is expensive. It would be helpful if we could get a three-year grant to support this work.

Pat Ashley requested to receive progress data on this topic in order to set goals and keep our eyes on it. She suggested setting goals for 2020 and moving forward to reach the goals we set.

    a.   Partnership w/K-12 in math (grant needed)
    b.   Provide the Board with progress data on goals set (less past data)
        a.   How do we measure success?

e. Campus Nexus impact on future data

RogueNet replacement: The company name is Campus Management and the product name is Campus Nexus. Ms. Roe provided the following information (see file).

Improved Data Quality

    a.   Correction of migrated data
    b.   Greater data validations upon data being entered into the system
    c.   Data warehousing allowing for specific point of time recreation

Reduced Staff Time in Compliance Reporting

    a.   Campus Nexus retains 50-60 staff which follow compliance reporting requirements
    b.   Campus Nexus updates reports and pushes them to college
    c.   Less time on IPEDS
    d.   Less time on Gainful Employment

Additional Impacts

    a.   Fully integrated with Microsoft Power BI (i.e. data dashboards)
    b.   More data 'self-service' environment for faculty and staff
    c.   Greater data security

A dashboard consists of data visualizations and data infographics. It is an interactive tool to "slice and dice" data.

11.A.a 3

In order to build data dashboards one must be able to:

a. Pull data from the system (ERP)
b. Calculate appropriate metrics (SQL & DAX)
c. Embed appropriate metrics within the dashboard tool (Microsoft Power BI)
d. Potentially embedded dashboard into a website or SharePoint site
e. Have a certain level of Graphic Design knowledge

Staff are already developing a basic pilot dashboard which will include:

a. Trend headcount data by a variety of subgroups
b. FTE

Ms. Roe encouraged Board members to forward other ideas regarding dashboard items.

Dr. Talbert suggested, how do we know we're doing our job to make sure taxpayers and students get their money's worth? What percentage of students enroll in courses and over time successfully complete?

15 minute break

4. **Financial Data Discussion** – Lisa Stanton, Chief Financial Officer and Curtis Sommerfeld, Vice President of College Services, provided a PowerPoint presentation (see file).

   a. Establishing an impactful financial dashboard, and
   b. Parameters for quality
      - Meet the objective
      - Contain less than 10 metrics
      - Metrics will be quantitative
      - Metrics will be easy to calculate and understand
      - Metrics will require little manual manipulation
      - Metrics can be updated at predictable intervals
      - Visually appealing and understandable

   c. Critical baseline metrics
      1. Revenues
         a. State appropriations
         b. Tuition and fees

2. Expenses
   a. Materials and services
   b. Personnel/benefits

3. Reserves
   a. Primary reserve

d. Other metrics the Board would like to see
   - Dashboard examples were reviewed (see file) and the following additional dashboard ideas were provided by the Board:

     a. Would like to see reserve levels on a consistent basis
     b. Send quarterly data to District Budget Committee non-board members
     c. Foundation report – separate dashboard
     d. Staffing costs vs. student numbers
     e. Would like dashboard items to help Board members answer questions posed by the public about how RCC is doing
     f. Part-time vs. full-time students
     g. 3 and 5 year trend lines
     h. Show how our expenses and revenues are relating
     i. Items to help with decision making
     j. Actual vs. projection
     k. Year over year comparisons
     l. Track reserve balance to help with decision on using reserve funding
     m. Breakout dedicated reserves vs. other reserves
     n. The green light example is good, but add arrow to indicate if it is trending up or down
     o. Provide a comparison to other community colleges
     p. Construction bond funding spent to date a) remaining balance and b) broken out by project
     q. Operating budget vs. actual, indicate + or –
     r. Discussion triggers for board to address
     s. Arrows for trending
     t. Visuals and numbers
     u. One dashboard for various data "whole picture in one place"
     v. Historical trends vs. current trends
     w. Staff and operating expenses per program
     x. Average class size to use as a trend indicator
     y. Cost/use of facilities

  e. Key performance indicators were reviewed

    1. State appropriations
     a. Percent of expense paid
     b. RCC's percent

    2. Tuition and fees
     a. Historical trends by term/year
     b. Forecast vs. actual by term/year

    3. Materials and services
     a. Percent of total expenses

    4. Personnel/benefits
     a. Percent of total expenses

Miscellaneous suggestions, thoughts and ideas:

 A. Roger Stokes and Shawn Hogan agreed they would like to review program performances, and also discuss meeting the need of the market, during the annual budget discussions. It is important to look at the operating expenses per program.

 B. Kevin Talbert would like administration to analyze data and provide information to the Board which would be helpful when making decisions.

 C. What are the Board's 4 to 6 things they need to focus on in 2018/19, 2019/20, etc.?

  Board members were asked to contact Lisa Stanton or Curtis Sommerfeld with any other thoughts or ideas.

  Lunch – 12:00 to 1:15 p.m. Attendees participated in a game from Achieving the Dream during their lunch break.

5. 2016-2020 Strategic Plan Assessment – Laurie Roe provided a PowerPoint presentation (see file).

 a. Transition to the 2017-2020 Strategic Plan necessitated an adjustment to the metrics associated with:
   • Institutional mission fulfillment
   • Department strategic planning outcomes and reporting processes

 b. Departmental Strategic Planning

- Pilot year
- Process simplified
- Process designed for multiple uses
- Departments report goals, then later report outcomes related to their departmental goals

c. Ms. Roe presented information on the following items (see file):
  - Current college wide distribution of department level strategic goals
  - Program examples of best practices – adult basic skills and educational partnerships
  - Program areas of need **–** President Kemper-Pelle noted we are thinking about administering a survey at In-service regarding collaboration
  - Role and purpose of Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool (ICAT) – Will review at an upcoming Board meeting
  - Role and purpose of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and SENSE survey with the "entering student" for engagement during the first 3 weeks the student is in college. Ms. Roe provided a definition of CCSSEE – and CCSSEE results (see file)

6. **Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)** – Kori Ebenhack, Vice President of Student Services, provided a presentation on four different enrollment management perspectives and RCC's current enrollment management effort. It is a very broad and varied attempt to get students in the system and keep them in the system. The entire college is involved in varying aspects of enrollment management. This is a complicated plan at which she believes we are succeeding. Efforts are focused toward improving loss enrollment.

Four Strategies:
  1. Student focused
  2. Administrative
  3. Market Centered
  4. Academic Focused

Ms. Ebenhack reviewed a persistence and attainment outcomes chart (see file) and loss-momentum framework (see file).

Dr. Talbert mentioned that at Southern Oregon University (SOU) students could take two classes without taking a placement test.

Ms. Ebenhack reported there is a higher scholarship need compared to the scholarships we provide. Also, students would benefits from the creation of a tuition break. Ms. Ebenhack would like to see an improvement in the area of student employment as we have money left over for student employees at the end of the year.

A request was made to provide the Board with a comparison between FTE pre-Jackson County (1996) and now. What is the penetration? What should it be? (mission)

20 minute break

7. **Strategic Enrollment Management** – Leo Hirner, Vice President of Instruction, provided a PowerPoint presentation (see file).

There are three big challenges for Instructional Services:

1. Enrollment/Retention/Completion
   - 3 year graduation rate - 8.5% (RCC) vs 46% (national)
   - FTE Ratio 28% (RCC) vs 36% (Oregon community colleges)

2. Accreditation
   - Faculty credentials
   - Assessment
   - Program review

3. Developmental Education
   - Number of students that currently test into Developmental Education
   - Impact of Developmental Education on completion
   - Impact of Developmental Education on scheduling

Establish goals/plans for success:

Goal 1: Schedule for completion

- 15 to finish model
- Morning/afternoon/evening blocks
- Target AGS/AAOT
- Does not address Developmental Education challenge to completion

11.A.a 8

Goal 2: Faculty census

- Holistic view of our faculty
- Identify strengths, gaps, needs
- Do we have the faculty to support Goal #1?
- Do we have retirement(s) to worry about?
- Addresses accreditation concern with faculty credentials
- No metric, but will inform other goals and planning

Goal 3: Assessment plan and program review revision

- Develop annual assessment cycle using embedded instruments
- Spring In-service – review results and plan
- Fall – collect data
- Winter – compile results
- Program review includes assessment results

Goal 4: Support enrollment and retention efforts

Interventions

- Dev Ed – Multiple Measures
- Re-Enrollment Initiatives
- Early Alert – AVISO
- Online Gradebook – Blackboard

The following thought was posed: Will Developmental Education numbers decline as the shift happens? Will there be a tutoring impact?

8. **Next Steps** – Lois Schlegel, Facilitator

A. Goals for board/president:
   1. Set next special meeting (work session) as soon as possible
   2. Conversation about Board support of staff
      a. Culture
      b. Best practices
      c. Statement of support (Aspen institute) our future depends on these reforms / priorities / maintain focus

- Claudia will work with Cathy to outline statement then schedule 1.5 hours in conjunction with a regularly scheduled Board meeting. Send draft out in advance, receive input, approve at Board meeting when finalized.
- There was a recommendation for the Board Chair to present the statement to the College in person.
- Look into creating video clips.

3. By the end of this fiscal year we will have a student success plan in place that is based on the self-study and expert advice of the Achieving the Dream (ATD) coach.

4. Develop communication early on, to include the District Budget Committee non-board members, to understand budget concerns and develop solutions.

5. Board 2018/19 Information Meetings (same schedule as last year)
   Suggested topics:

   a. Progress on ATD or self-study guided pathways (winter)
   b. Invite legislators – educate, build relationships (before January)
   c. Early changes in scheduling + and – (spring)
   d. Board support for partnership w/K-12 (CTE Academy)
   e. First look at dashboards for Board to give feedback

9. **Adjournment** – Claudia Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.
   Note: See nest page for "parking lot" items.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by Denise Nelson, Assistant to the President – Governance.

Parking Lot

August 2, 2018 Board of Education Retreat

1. Why don't students take a full load?

2. Why are students at RCC?

3. Math – movement on change and other problems to address gateway classes

4. Math requirements?

5. What cant the Board do to support partnership with K-12?

6. Other ideas for data dashboards

7. Discuss how poverty impacts completion

8. What is poverty?

9. Collaborative learning
   - Strategic goal evolution
   - Space vs. usage

10. Tuition break (enrollment)

11. Student employment

12. Change scholarship process to be more inclusive

13. Pre-requisites and scheduling problems

14. Is placement testing needed?

15. More unrestricted funds from the Foundation? (for "middle class" left-out students)

16. Collecting input data – income of students / other factors

17. Policy discussion about how we share grade distribution data

18. General budget factors – 2019/20
    - Info needed to determine cuts
    - Faculty contract