

Fall 2017 In-Service Budget Workshop Results

Prepared by Diana Pineda & Benjamin Gamboa

Purpose of Brief

The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results from the fall 2017 In-Service Budget Workshop surveys completed by 90 respondents.

Summary of Findings

- Innovations and Active Management of Schedule were the overall highest and second-highest ranked strategies, respectively, with respondents believing they were more student-centered but not as sustainable.
- Reduce Expenditures was overwhelmingly the lowest ranked strategy with only 12% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that this strategy was student-centered.
- Additional ideas included reconsidering college hour; developing evening, weekend, and cohort-style programs; expanding business and community partnerships; developing pathway programs like a middle college and promise program; collaborating better with SBVC; retooling the district resource allocation model; hiring more faculty to support growth; and improving online registration processes.

Overview

On August 11, 2017, Crafton Hills College (CHC) faculty and staff gathered for the fall 2017 In-Service Day. Annual In-Service Days usually take place the week before instruction begins with an intent to inform the campus (faculty and staff) of the college's goals and focus for the upcoming semester and how the college is progressing toward those goals. The fall 2017 In-Service Day focused on the college budget where presentations informed the campus of the current progress with the budget and then group discussions considered strategies to address the budget. The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results of the In-Service Budget workshop surveys completed by 90 respondents.

Methodology

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (OIERP) in collaboration with CHC managers developed a two-sided, one-page paper survey to collect feedback from faculty and staff on various strategies in regards to the college budget. The survey included 10 predetermined strategies for which respondents were instructed to rate their level of agreement on how well the strategies meet four predefined criteria: feasibility, student-centeredness, budget-consciousness, and sustainability. The following 4-point Likert-scale was utilized: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree. The 10 predetermined strategies included the following: Active Management of Schedule, Retention, Outreach & Partnerships, Marketing, University Partnerships, Program Viability, Scheduling Practices, Innovations, Advancement, and Reduce Expenditures. Respondents were also provided with the opportunity to provide their own strategies, which they were also instructed to rate their level of agreement using the same 4-point Likert scale. Finally, respondents were asked to describe in greater detail any additional ideas they provided in an open-ended format. To organize feedback received, additional comments/suggestions were categorized by topic. A limitation to grouping any open-ended responses into categories is that researchers may group them differently.

Findings

Tables I through II illustrate the results of the findings from the In-Service Budget workshop surveys in fall 2017.

Table 1 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Active Management of Schedule strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was student-centered (91%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (84%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked second overall.

Table 1. Respondents' level of agreement of Active Management of Schedule on criteria.

Active Management of Schedule	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	44	53.0	27	32.5	9	10.8	3	3.6	83
Student-centered	56	69.1	18	22.2	4	4.9	3	3.7	81
Budget-conscious	40	49.4	32	39.5	7	8.6	2	2.5	81
Sustainable	42	53.2	24	30.4	11	13.9	2	2.5	79

Table 2 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Retention strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (95%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (77%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked third overall (tied with Scheduling Practices).

Table 2. Respondents' level of agreement of Retention on criteria.

Retention	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	32	39.5	44	54.3	4	4.9	1	1.2	81
Student-centered	57	69.5	21	25.6	4	4.9	0	0.0	82
Budget-conscious	23	29.1	39	49.4	17	21.5	0	0.0	79
Sustainable	24	30.8	36	46.2	15	19.2	3	3.8	78

Table 3 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Outreach & Partnerships strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (91%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (76%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked fifth overall.

Table 3. Respondents' level of agreement of Outreach & Partnerships on criteria.

Outreach & Partnerships	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	41	51.9	31	39.2	5	6.3	2	2.5	79
Student-centered	52	65.0	21	26.3	6	7.5	1	1.3	80
Budget-conscious	27	35.5	34	44.7	14	18.4	1	1.3	76
Sustainable	30	39.5	28	36.8	14	18.4	4	5.3	76

Table 4 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Marketing strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (86%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was budget-conscious (67%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked ninth overall.

Table 4. Respondents' level of agreement of Marketing on criteria.

Marketing	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	39	47.0	32	38.6	8	9.6	4	4.8	83
Student-centered	33	38.8	33	38.8	16	18.8	3	3.5	85
Budget-conscious	25	31.6	28	35.4	22	27.8	4	5.1	79
Sustainable	26	34.2	25	32.9	20	26.3	5	6.6	79

Table 5 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for University Partnerships strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was student-centered (90%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (80%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked sixth overall.

Table 5. Respondents' level of agreement of University Partnerships on criteria.

University Partnerships	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	35	43.2	31	38.3	13	16.0	2	2.5	81
Student-centered	47	58.8	25	31.3	7	8.8	1	1.3	80
Budget-conscious	26	36.6	31	43.7	12	16.9	2	2.8	71
Sustainable	25	35.7	31	44.3	10	14.3	4	5.7	70

Table 6 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Program Viability strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (83%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was budget-conscious (76%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked eighth overall.

Table 6. Respondents' level of agreement of Program Viability on criteria.

Program Viability	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	31	40.3	33	42.9	9	11.7	4	5.2	77
Student-centered	29	39.2	30	40.5	13	17.6	2	2.7	74
Budget-conscious	25	33.8	31	41.9	15	20.3	3	4.1	74
Sustainable	19	26.0	40	54.8	8	11.0	6	8.2	73

Table 7 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Scheduling Practices strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was budget-conscious (93%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (82%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked third overall (tied with Retention).

Table 7. Respondents' level of agreement of Scheduling Practices on criteria.

Scheduling Practices	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	41	57.7	21	29.6	6	8.5	3	4.2	71
Student-centered	37	51.4	22	30.6	9	12.5	4	5.6	72
Budget-conscious	39	57.4	24	35.3	2	2.9	3	4.4	68
Sustainable	34	50.0	22	32.4	6	8.8	6	8.8	68

Table 8 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Innovations strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was student-centered (93%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (82%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked first overall.

Table 8. Respondents' level of agreement of Innovations on criteria.

Innovations	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	40	55.6	24	33.3	6	8.3	2	2.8	72
Student-centered	48	65.8	20	27.4	3	4.1	2	2.7	73
Budget-conscious	33	50.0	24	36.4	8	12.1	1	1.5	66
Sustainable	30	45.5	24	36.4	6	9.1	6	9.1	66

Table 9 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Advancement strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was feasible (88%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was sustainable (70%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked seventh overall.

Table 9. Respondents' level of agreement of Advancement on criteria.

Advancement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	28	43.1	29	44.6	5	7.7	3	4.6	65
Student-centered	24	36.4	25	37.9	12	18.2	5	7.6	66
Budget-conscious	36	56.3	20	31.3	5	7.5	3	4.7	64
Sustainable	23	35.9	22	34.4	14	21.9	5	7.8	64

Table 10 presents respondents' ranking of the criteria for Reduce Expenditures strategies. Respondents were most likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was budget-conscious (63%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that this strategy was student-centered (12%). Off all predefined strategies, this strategy ranked last overall and was an outlier among the rankings with the other strategies. Respondents overwhelmingly believed this strategy was not feasible, student-centered, nor sustainable.

Table 10. Respondents' level of agreement of Reduce Expenditures on criteria.

Reduce Expenditures	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Feasible	13	18.8	18	26.1	21	30.4	17	24.6	69
Student-centered	5	7.5	3	4.5	27	40.3	32	47.8	67
Budget-conscious	19	27.9	24	35.3	12	17.6	13	19.1	68
Sustainable	7	10.6	9	13.6	22	33.3	28	42.4	66

When excluding the strategy to reduce expenditures from the overall analysis, respondents on average were most likely to agree or strongly agree that the predetermined strategies were feasible (87%) and least likely to agree or strongly agree that the predetermined strategies were sustainable (78%).

Table 11 includes respondents' additional ideas for consideration. The ideas were grouped into generalizable categories: scheduling improvements, outreach and marketing suggestions, specific budget changes, additional faculty and staff, other suggestions, and requests for additional data. Commonly mentioned ideas included eliminating, moving, or reducing college hour; developing evening, weekend, and cohort-style programs; expanding partnerships with businesses and community organizations; developing pathway programs like middle college and a promise program; collaborating better with SBVC; retooling the district resource allocation model; hiring more full-time faculty to support growth; and improving online registration processes.

Table 11. Respondents' ideas

Scheduling Improvements (n=46)
"non-semester" (cohort) diploma offerings.
Acceleration project for math and English courses.
Build schedule of classes for CTE on F/Sat.
College hour is ineffective.
Get rid of college hour please!!
Get rid of college hour! (n=2)
Get rid of college hour.
Not offering classes during college hour is a huge burner to enrollment that I have noticed.
Or move college hour to 3-4PM on all days
Remove College Hour
Consider college hour only 2x per week, later in the day. College hour is underutilized and at times overbooked, erratic usage and unpaid teaching hours, mega time suck.
Develop interdisciplinary programs i.e. Art and business.
Exercise courses for senior citizens. Open pool hours for public, i.e. exercise classes for senior citizens.
Faculty are resistant to new scheduling patterns that are best for students.
More online classes/night and weekend classes.
Night classes for the working class.
Noncredit, ESL, and middle college strike me as good ideas.
Offer a strong evening program.

(Table 11 continued on next page!)

(Table II continued!)

Reentry focus program. Clear pathways for re-entry students like 4 years do. Where students can come in every T/TH from 6-10 for 2 years and finish AA
Schedule class based on student's needs.
Stacking classes to maximize efficiency (e.g. credit and noncredit). Having credit and noncredit sections in the same class to increase the efficiency of classes.
Change ed plan agenda to boost enrollment in the non G.E. Update?????
Horrible scheduling for students, especially with lecture/labs.
Increase cap on classes!
More weekend and online sections.
Offer a weekend college program.
Offer students that have been dropped from cancelled classes other option.
Offering major specific classes that are needed at the SAME time and date. Majors that have done this are CIS, Art, etc. This is not student centered and should be reviewed.
Participate in the online education initiative (OEI). Increase enrollment in online courses by opening them to all students in CCC.
Short-term classes, accelerated program. Need to have short-term classes align with each other so students can get through sooner.
Student-centered class schedule.
Weekend classes. Working adult programs.
Weekend science courses.
Winter intersession.
2 year course schedule.
Classes/certs aimed at professional advancement.
Full weekend college.
Not having a major track that can be completed at night.
Offer a middle college program.
Offer more Fri/Weekend like Valley! More online classes.
PAC done in 2 years.
Schedule based on student needs [adult learners].
Adult programs. Weekends.
More online classes
More online courses / less linked classes!
Short 5 week courses.
Outreach and Partnerships (n=36)
Collaboration with SBVC.
Collaboration with our sister college. The idea is being student centered.
Create partnership with University for transfer cohort. What DSPS can do. Outreach to HS constant contact. Give away. Be more visible.
Develop specific partnering programs that have potential for direct enhancement of employment potential.
Greater media alerts: Billboards, bus signs, etc.
Marketing. Why not explore Riverside city. Huge market with zero/little awareness of CHC/ Especially CTE options at CHC.
More outreach with high schools.
Open buildings to HS courses. Rent out area.
Partner with local businesses who want to educate their workforce.
Partnership with major businesses in our area. Either get rid of class caps or increase them.
QA. Many of us or not qualified to make these decisions. Experts with the strengths in these fields should be consulted.

(Table II continued on next page!)

(Table II continued!)

Student promise program. Connect with 5 th or 8 th graders and provide a promise of education to them. For promised enrollment, maybe a few free classes or scholarships.
Treat both colleges as a district.
More campus activities to attract students.
Websites increase web presence to draw in student.
Emeritus program designed to address the needs of our large senior population. Example Richland Community College, Dallas, TX. Ask them How!!
Expand child care opportunities/single moms.
Full on marketing team.
Partnership with Universities – lease new spaces (\$\$) – Help students get ahead with upper level classes.
Partnerships with local unions and employers to develop training programs.
Presence in community organizations to guide students to college.
College village for partnership building.
College village.
Marketing needs funds and vision. Create a message. Marketing is important, but with a cohesive vision! Will have positive impact and long-lasting positive impact.
More events on campus and publicly.
More marketing.
More master students to help.
Target CSUSB and UCR for students that could be dually enrolled.
Business partnerships.
Consolidate vision of individuality. Create a message. To consolidate but more fundamentally DEVELOP with full integration). Create an impactful student center message.
Increase marketing.
More outreach to businesses (train employees)
The website is a facility, esp. for new and online students, it should be considered more.
What happened to the H.S. charter school for the old gym?
Specific Budget Changes (n=16)
Decrease salaries of management!
Promote payment plan over waiving tuition fees.
Tuition fees – Payment plan. Payment plan on tuition fees instead of waiving it until the end of the semester.
Decrease pay for chancellor and District positions.
Interim unfilled. Letting some of our interim dean positions remained unfilled.
Reduce Admin.
Reduce administrative expenditures and salaries.
Reduce the amount of administration.
Rework the funding model with the district so that it is balanced. Our current model allows Valley to have surplus while we make cuts.
Student workers. Increase utilization of student workers throughout campus. This would allow us to drop some positions, or fill new positions cheaply while allowing [students to gain experience.]
Cut conferences. Don't need to send 15 people to one conference. 1 person per dept. Cut goods at events.
Force the district to share honest budgets for EDCT and KVCR. They should also do PPR.
Reduce admin size at Crafton and District. Cut district overhead.
Outsource the bookstore. Pretty straight forward.
Decrease salaries – 91% (management)
Use surplus at Valley, KVCR, and District to fund Crafton.

(Table II continued on next page!)

(Table II continued!)

Additional Faculty and Staff (n=11)
Additional staff.
FT faculty. Hire more full time faculty. Replace retirees. Good faculty bring in more students.
Hire more faculty. We will not grow without it.
Keeping instructors in the classroom to generate FTES.
Many of these activities could be effective; however, to keep costs down, current staff would have to do more work.
More faculty.
Hire fulltime instructional faculty to make the above things happen/ They bring in FTES! Should be.
If the college is going to add new programs, it will also need to make an investment in faculty (new) to develop and implement new programs.
How do we expect to successfully serve students without the staff and faculty?
Hire more faculty.
May cost more to hire faculty.
Other Suggestions (n=11)
Need to focus on initiatives that do not add additional work to already overloaded faculty and staff.
Pay faculty to enroll in classes. Split difference in FTES that come in.
Automate web advisor.
How to figure out faculty pay stub and HT access it online.
Make webadvisor MUCH more user friendly.
Staff enroll in a CHC course.
Less institutional power to faculty. The power struggle between faculty and administration is the reason we are in this [trouble].
Pay more attention to classified staff. There is zero institutional power with classified and a sense of classism within faculty and admin.
Stop letting faculty dictate what path the college is going on!
Bus to carry students back and forth from CHC to SBVC.
Please do not reduce services. We need services as we need it for everyone (faculty and staff) that are on campus.
Requests for Additional Data (n=5)
While capturing the demand for sections is essential, it still misses the market segments that we don't currently have.
[Options] G & J are hard to answer as there are multiples that are mutually exclusive.
These questions have multiple variables.
Provide info on demand and successful practices. [Option] M is related to F
Research and evaluate interests in community. This should precede any major changes and innovations. Understand the needs of the community by doing research, surveys.