



STATE CENTER COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Signature Programs Taskforce Summary

10:30 - 11:30 a.m.

DO South Conference Room/RC PCR/WI AC2-149B

Notes from Meeting of December 14, 2012

Present: Brett Camacho, Jim Chin, David Clark, Natalie Culver-Dockins, Cynthia Elliot, Ed Eng, Kelly Fowler, Pamela Gilmore, Kirtley King, Tom Mester, George Railey, Amanda Taintor, Christopher Whiteside, Tim Woods, Kerry Ybarra

The meeting was called to order at 10:44 a.m. by G. Railey.

I. Review of Signature Programs Taskforce Charge Statement

G. Railey began by reading the draft Signature Program Taskforce charge statement, as distributed to the group by email prior to the meeting. He then asked each campus to describe what they felt defined a signature program.

RC: (D. Clark) This definition was discussed in the President's Cabinet meeting and it seems that this definition can fall into one of two categories; a) programs that are unique to a college/campus and not replicated at other sites in the district, b) high-cost programs. It was pointed out later in the meeting that part of the reason that the cost of programs is being factored into its role as a 'signature' program may be due to current budgetary constraints and funding model discussions for campuses.

FCC: (C. Whiteside) There is some interest in seeing how other colleges define their signature programs, but generally the 'non-replication' model described above is definition that seems most reasonable. T. Woods went on to state later in the meeting that the role of the program in the larger community should also be a factor in analysis.

WI: (T. Mester) There was a discussion of the district-level approach to resource allocation, wherein it was also noted that enrollment must support a programs costs. J. Chin noted that signature programs should be unique, but that sometimes programs could and should be duplicated at multiple sites in order to best serve the total number of students who are requesting access (nursing). He did note that cost must be a consideration in these decisions.

There was also some discussion later in the meeting of changing state funding models, such as the CCCCO's new distribution of CTE funds, and how those will affect the manner in which signature programs and their associated funding will be viewed. It was noted that the proposed District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce (DRAMT) funding model will have an effect on this definition as well. T. Mester noted that high-cost programs existed prior to the district being formed, and that the role of the district was to help regulate the cost of services that could be combined at multiple sites. D. Clark noted that new funding mechanisms may include colleges paying for site-level programs while the funding for district-level programs would be taken off the top of the initial state/federal funding distributions.

II. Definition of Key Terms: Signature Programs

G. Railey noted that consensus on a definition will be a top priority as it will drive all of the work completed by the taskforce. He believes that the threshold to define a signature program must be high and suggested the following be considered as a part of the decision making process:

- 1) Program success rates;*
- 2) Number of certificates completed/awarded;
- 3) Employment rates;*
- 4) Program demand (industry and community);*
- 5) Cost (ROI);*
- 6) Program efficiency (utilization of categorical vs. external resources);

**Dr. Railey noted later in the discussion that these items were ones that other colleges also use to define their signature programs.*

This led to a discussion of the role of program review at the campuses in selecting programs for funding at the campus level, and what level of interaction the Signature Program Taskforce's work would operate at (district vs. campus level decision making). Dr. Railey clarified that consideration of these items should not be seen as a separate program review by the district, simply that there should be a checklist of desired characteristics that a 'signature' program should have. In addition, the success rates of these items can then be used in marketing the programs themselves to the larger community. T. Mester noted that some programs will not rise to this level simply because they are 'gateways' to a higher level of certification training, and are not themselves an endpoint for certificate completion/employment.

III. Next Steps

It was noted that the following items should be developed:

Group members to develop lists of CTE/Perkins eligible programs that their campuses currently offer. These lists to be forwarded to C. Crill-Hornsby to be included in Blackboard site discussed below.

T. Woods and D. Clark to research how other colleges/districts define 'signature programs' and report results back to group at the next meeting.

G. Railey to follow up with campus presidents to determine if they have received documentation on signature programs from the following campus locations (per prior meeting notes): Riverside CC, College of Alameda, Los Rios CC. Will report results back to group at the next meeting.

C. Crill-Hornsby to develop and publish Blackboard site for members use in retrieving and warehousing documents for groups use. These will include taskforce charge statement, WASC report sections related to groups work, prior agendas, meeting summaries and program lists referred to above.

Meeting adjourned at 11:31 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Cherylyn Crill-Hornsby

Future Agenda Items:

1. Review of Example Signature Programs Guidelines (from prior groups work)
2. Review of Example definitions of Signature Programs (T. Woods, D. Clark)
3. Review lists of Perkins eligible programs to determine district patterns that may help determine an SCCC definition of Signature Programs (all).

Next meeting January 18, 2013 at 1:00 PM

NOTE: Assignments are underlined