Study Session Agenda

3:00  Call to Order, Introductions ................................................................. Bruce Lachney
3:05  Legislative Update ................................................................. Bruce Lachney
3:10  Presidential Evaluation ................................................................. Bruce Lachney
3:20  Presidential Search Process ................................................................. Bruce Lachney
3:30  Audit of SAI data used by the College Brain Trust for ......................... Bruce Lachney  Tab 1
Clovler Park Technical College
3:40  ACCT National Legislative Summit ........................................................ Bruce Lachney
3:45  Upcoming Events
ACCT National Legislative Summit  February 11-14, Washingtorn, D.C.
Foundation Board Meeting  February 19, 12:00-1:30 p.m., Rainier Room
All Staff Meeting  February 19, 3:00-4:30 p.m., Bldg. 3, Rotunda
3:50  General Discussion ................................................................. Bruce Lachney

Regular Meeting Agenda

4:00  Call to Order, Flag Salute, Introductions ................................................................. Bruce Lachney
Action
Adoption of Agenda ................................................................. Bruce Lachney  Tab 2
Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of ................................................................. Bruce Lachney  Tab 3
January 9, 2013
Action
Approval of the Special Board of Trustees Retreat ................................................................. Bruce Lachney  Tab 4
January 14, 2013
Action
4:05 President’s Report .........................................................Jim Tuttle (Acting President)
SBCTC Applied Baccalaureate Committee Meeting (Jim Tuttle to report)
Wellness Committee (Jim Tuttle to report)
Workforce Development Council Meeting (Jim Tuttle to report)
Meetings with Brandman University and University of Phoenix (Jim Tuttle to report)
St. Martins University RN-BSN MOU Signing Ceremony (Jim Tuttle to report)
Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce Horizons Economic Forecast Breakfast
(Linda Schoonmaker to report)
Community Leaders Workforce Development Project (Mark Martinez to report)
WACTC Meeting (Amy Goings to report)

4:20 Other College Reports
ASG Report.................................................................................June Stacey-Clemons Tab 5
Fiscal 2012 2nd Quarter Report ....................................................Linda Schoonmaker Tab 6
Instruction Report ..........................................................................Lori Banaszak Tab 7
Massage Studies, Yvonne Meziere

4:50 Chair’s Report ........................................................................Bruce Lachney

4:55 Board Reports and/or Remarks ................................................All

5:00 Public Comments .....................................................................Bruce Lachney

5:05 New Business ..........................................................................Bruce Lachney

5:10 Executive Session .....................................................................Bruce Lachney
The Board may hold an executive session for purposes allowed under the Open Public Meetings Act. Legal purposes include, to consider acquisition or sale of real estate; to review negotiations of publicly bid contracts; to receive and evaluate complaints or charges brought against a public officer or employee; to evaluate the qualifications of an applicant for public employment; to review the performance of a public employee; and to discuss with legal counsel matters relating to agency enforcement actions, litigation, or potential litigation. Before convening in executive session, the Board Chair will publicly announce the purpose for executive session and the time when the executive session is expected to conclude.

5:40 Action Items as a Result of Executive Session.........................Bruce Lachney

5:50 Adjournment ..........................................................................Bruce Lachney
All Board meetings will be recorded.
To: President and Trustees, Clover Park Technical College  
From: Bruce Lachney  
Subject: Audit of SAI data used by the College Brain Trust for Clover Park Technical College’s Strategic Plan review  
Date: January 27, 2013

Background:

The College Brain Trust consultant group was commissioned by the Clover Park Board of Trustees to assist in a review of its 5 year strategic plan. The review is a multi-layered assessment of the college’s present plan culminating in recommendations to the Board and senior staff suggesting substantive changes. The plan includes: mission assessment, visioning, stakeholder involvement, facilities assessment, resource and funding instruments, strategic goal setting and performance as it relates to state alignment and curriculum delivery. The plan assessment and board recommendations are heavily data driven. The College Brain Trust’s analysis about the student achievement portion of the strategic plan review relies on how data relates to measuring achievement. A significant part of the College Brain Trust analysis uses data mined from the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI).

A performance reporting and funding policy known as the Student Achievement Initiative (SAI) was launched by the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) in 2007. SAI’s mission is to improve public accountability by more clearly defining and measuring student success, and, provide financial incentives as benchmarks are achieved. SAI qualitative results were based on a synthesis of interviews within the SBCTC community. Quantitative success was measured by “achievement points” accumulated within four categories of achievement:

- Building towards college-level skills (basic skills gains, passing precollege writing or math)
- First year retention (earning 15 then 30 college credits)
- Completing college-level math (passing math course required for either technical or academic associate degrees)
- Completions (degrees, certificates, apprenticeship training)

SAI tenets for funding and measurement:

**Principles for Funding:** Colleges are rewarded for student improvement, colleges compete against themselves, funding is stable and predictable, funds as an incentive.

**Principles for Measurement:** recognize students in all mission areas, measure incremental gains, measures are simple and valid, measures focus on student improvement that can be influenced by college.
On January 14, the College Brain Trust delivered, at a strategic planning workshop, a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation was the first rollout of its data assessment. The College Brain Trust will make specific recommendations about the direction of the college driven by its SAI data collection.

**Problem Statement:**

*As recommendations for the college depend heavily on aggregated SAI data, did the College Brain Trust access the right information, weigh the appropriate variables, and use the right methodology to formulate its conclusions? And, did the College Brain Trust recommendations, driven by SAI data, provide appropriate attention to political and administrative feasibility?*

**Compiling the Data:**

The College Brain Trust primarily relied on two data sources: the Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges and Clover Park Technical College.

The Washington State Board of Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) is the overseeing institution for two-year institutions in the State of Washington. The SBCTC operates as the pass-through of funding and policy for the State Legislature and Governors Office.

Clover Park Technical College (CPTC) collects and compiles student data with respect to both required information (name, date of birth, etc…) and volunteered information (gender, race, etc…) CPTC also collects specific data to comply with SAI.

Aside quantitative data collection, the College Brain Trust assembled stakeholder information through interviews and comments: to include, senior staff, faculty, students, community and board members, etc…

**In compiling the data for this analysis I used:**

The Community College Research Center (CCRC), Teachers College, Columbia University, *Washington State Student Achievement Initiative Policy Study: Final Report December 2012*. I used the report as a baseline to quantitatively and qualitatively compare policy outcome conclusions. The CCRC’s report is a comprehensive 3-year study prepared for the SBCTC reviewing SAI’s goals.

I also spoke, or had communications with:
- Dr. Fran White and Dr. Diane Troyer, the College Brain Trust
- David Price, SBCTC Policy Analyst
- Davis Jenkins, CCRC Policy Study author
- President John Walstrum and VP Lori Banaszak, CPTC

**Reviewing the Data:**

The intent of the SAI was to create measurable outcomes driven by quantitative/qualitative benchmarks. However, questions surrounding the methodology of
the SAI universe sample, dataset collection and causal/correlation factors present questions.

SAI’s original framework allowed a college the ability to earn points when students achieve one or more educational milestones. Points would convert to an increase in funding. Originally, SAI funding provided a financial incentive to the college as a segregated package; dollars were not part of the institutions basic funding model. Points earned were added to base funding. As cited by the CCRC’s report, “However, due to budget reductions imposed on the college system nearly every year since the inception of the SAI, college base budgets have been reduced to form the new pool of SAI funds each year. Consequently, SAI funds earned in one year have not in fact increased college base budgets in subsequent years, as was original intention.” Though the intent of the SAI system is explicitly not to rank colleges, as it is a funding system not ordering system, the reality is, as there is a limited pool of resources colleges compete in a de facto manner for funds. Put simply, the system was designed to allocate new funds, but it has become a basis for reallocating existing funds. The paradigm shift in resource allocation calls into question the methodology; whether the measurable universe of each college is so different that program validity is in question. For example:

- The raw data universe of students at CPTC is significantly different than Pierce College (as well as others). A significant proportion of the student population at Pierce College is Running Start students (30%), at CPTC it less than (.05%). CPTC is open enrollment based, Pierce College (as well as others) require Running Start students to, “test in.”

- CPTC’s location, next to the largest military base in the Northwest, services a significant veteran-student population. Two-year institutions removed from military bases service a smaller population of former service members.

- How should international students be handled with the dataset?

- Another issue is that non-degree/non-credentialing students. Many of CPTC’s students come to the college for self-improvement ((a real-estate class (now discontinued) but part of the original funds competing pool, an American Sign Language Class, etc....)) This may not be significant for most colleges but at Clover Park where fulltime degree/credentialing enrollment is 5000 FTE’s per year, the self-improvement volume swells that number to 12,000 per annum. Under the tracking system used by the College Brain Trust SAI points were deducted as many students were not meeting the 15/30 college credit requirement. (The SBCTC understands this issue and is adjusting in the future. However, the College Brain Trust’s review includes the unadjusted dataset.)

- Also to be considered: CCRC interviews suggest that colleges (as well as CPTC) have a difficult time understanding why SAI points go up and down because they cannot connect them to a particular action at the college (which program pushed the right button.)
- Data aggregation at colleges (as noted by CRCC) suggests difficulties and anomalies in coding. What is the impact on SAI points when colleges code differently?

**Stakeholders:**

The Washington State Board of Community and Technical College (SBCTC) represent the interests of the Governor and the Legislature. Current policy dynamics are moving this stakeholder to seek quantifiable performance measures to promote student achievement. These new dynamics promote and enhanced funding schemes based on performance.

Clover Park Technical College (Trustees, Senior Staff and Faculty) support student advancement through education and workforce development. Support for new policies that drive funding through performance measures are met with pragmatic reserve.

Students have a stake in the new policies; any paradigm that reduces cost and time-in-program will be seen as significant. However, changes in program can generate discomfort and hesitation about effectiveness.

The public and industry support the idea of promoting performance metrics into the educational equation.

Legislators and Policy-makers are thoroughly sold on the benefits of a new policy dynamic that ties funding to performance.

**Alternatives:**

1) **One alternative is to return to a funding paradigm that more closely mirrors the original intent of the program.** The original genius behind the SAI framework is that each college competes against itself. From a quantitative standpoint assessing internal scorekeeping based on a larger framework eliminates the need to find statistical ways to manipulate a dataset that is inconsistent between colleges (Running Start, Veterans, International Students etc....) However, where reality vexes assumption is that funding is now resource limited and colleges compete against one another.

2) **So as not to be penalized, CPTC can create internal certificate completion awards that recognize the experience of the individual while codifying a completion code for SAI.** Funding is tied to four benchmarks (as noted earlier). Many of CPTC's students are non-degree/non-credentialing.

3) **CPTC should institute a committee to promote SAI promulgation.** CCRC interviews suggest there is a qualitative disconnect between what SAI should accomplish and administrative misunderstanding. CCRC suggests colleges create SAI committees to insure compliance and promote understanding.
4) CPTC should explore alternatives to data aggregation and capacity (as suggested by the College Brain Trust). All institutions provide data to SBCTC, consultant groups, grant-makers and others. Collection and aggregation of this information provides validity to program creation, function and sustainability. Different coding by institutions (as noted by CRCC) may short-change CPTC in the race for resources.

5) CPTC should wait out the various programs until one cohesive methodology appears. The Student Achievement Initiative is one of a number of programs attempting to link quantitative measures to achievement: the others presently in the queue are: Achieving The Dream (ATD) and Governance Institute on Student Success (GISS). ATD uses longitudinal cohort methodology, SAI cross-sectional, GISS blends the SAI cross-sectional data to find “tipping point,” cohort data.

Criteria and Outcomes Matrix:

Testing the feasibility of a number of alternatives, criteria were assigned to identify respective issues: efficiency, equity, administrative and political feasibility, as well as sustainability.

Efficiency was measured against a cost to benefit assumption for CPTC. The presumption here is there is an effect on resource dollars. For example, a particular policy shift will presume a cost to a particular department, and, presume to achieve a particular benefit. The actual expenditure of resources is not calculated here, as actually connecting dollars to programs to departments to causality is a broader exercise.

Equity presumes a qualitative measure of fairness is increased or decreased. The fairness of assigning resources to various population(s) of students within the CPTC would increase or decrease with the different alternatives. In particular, the equity of opportunity between student populations is the main consideration.

Administrative Feasibility is the ease at which alternatives will dovetail into existing administrative operations at the college.

Political Feasibility is the acceptability and likelihood that alternatives can exist in the present Legislative, State Board and college/public realities. It is a qualitative presumption of limitations; a place where want and impracticality collide.

Sustainability is the idea that given the proposed alternative the outcome will increase (more) or decrease (less) the sustainability of the SAI program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Efficiency Cost/benefit to college</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return to Original Funding Model</td>
<td>No cost to college</td>
<td>significant increase among populations</td>
<td>no issue for CPTC</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Completion Certificates</td>
<td>marginal increase maximize SAI pts.</td>
<td>some increase</td>
<td>Feasible but an increase in administrative time</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create SAI Committee</td>
<td>marginal increase</td>
<td>some increase</td>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Data Capacity</td>
<td>significant increase</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait out Various Models</td>
<td>no cost/loss of SAI pts.</td>
<td>initial loss of funding Decreases equity</td>
<td>Difficult unless other colleges join in</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome and Matrix Analysis:**

The College Brain Trust workshop illuminates numerous issues within the SAI policy. Constructing alternatives to address those deficiencies suggest both reasonable and untenable outcomes. Specifically, outcomes within the matrix suggest trade-offs will be necessary should CPTC wish to follow a particular alternative.

The alternative with the best outcome for the CPTC would be a return to the base funding model of the original design. This alternative would correct the issue of supplanting a design flaw (that of incongruent universe populations competing for funds) into the fundamental model. However, as funding is a component of the State Legislature, it is a fair assumption that little will be done on this point. Thus, though this is the best alternative for CPTC, it is to be seen as impractical as to the moment.

The alternative that CPTC should wait out the quantitative measure process altogether, though attractive on a number of levels, would be anathema to the present direction of SBCTC policy. It would be possible for the college to slow the compliance rate for conversion to prescribed measures (limiting the amount of resources expended on training, data collection and personnel), however, the school may find itself well behind when a “winning” quantitative measure takes hold.
Alternatives where the college can control outcomes seem more realistic. The Matrix illustrates a connection between creating an internal completion award program, initiating a CPTC SAI Committee, and, enhanced data aggregation and collection capacity; all reasonable measures the college can use to positively influence outcome. All three are Politically Feasible, Sustainable, and increase Equity and Efficiency. These three alternatives will need to be jointly vetted to assign scarce commitment of resource. That is, they should be considered a “stable” of alternatives and not one alternative fighting the other.

Conclusions:

CPTC’s strategic planning process sets the stage for the college to prosper beyond the limitations posed by economic restriction. A large part of that growth prosperity is contingent on the college maximizing scarce resources; quantitative and qualitative measures can help; but only if the measures are valid and creditable.

SAI data has problems. The original program framework allocated funds to colleges based on achievement points earned by its own community of students. As economic conditions required the reallocation of funds the program became an “ordered ranking” system; as such, the original quantitative design became one of a larger pool of incongruent populations. To be truly fair a performance funding policy should take account of differences in populations of students served. Further, colleges (as well as CPTC) that received funds could never adequately connect what actually drove an increase in student achievement; they lacked a correlation to causality connection. Coupled with competing quantitative/qualitative programs that use different methodology (longitudinal cohort v. cross sectional) colleges fret over whether the investment in resources is better spent elsewhere; waiting until the various programs sort themselves out.

Did the College Brain Trust access the right information, weigh the appropriate variables, and use the right methodology to formulate its conclusions? And, did the College Brain Trust recommendations, driven by SAI data, provide appropriate attention to political and administrative feasibility?

Yes, but...

The College Brain Trust used data that had issues. They should have acknowledged the weakness in the methodology from the SBCTC, and, the College Brain Trust should have referenced the work done by the Community College Research Center.

However, regardless of the dataset flaws, the College Brain Trust’s presentation illustrates to the CPTC Board the need to discuss strategic goal setting with regard to competing institutional methodologies, political/administrative feasibility, advocacy for funding, and state data congruency.
Recommendations and Trade-offs:

Even though there are suspected weaknesses in the SAI program, the use of quantitative/qualitative measures in student achievement is here to stay. With the eventual move to financial reward for quantitative/qualitative improvement (whether truly correlative or not) the college will have to submit to a partial trade-off of curriculum decision-making autonomy. That is, some curricular decisions will now, in part, be made with regard to incentive funding.

Understanding the weaknesses and trade-offs the review of the College Brain Trust, SBCTC methodology, Community College Research Center and Clover Park Technical College methods reveal that the college should address those alternatives it can control. Taken in a conjoined fashion, the college should:

- Create internal completion awards
- Create an SAI Committee
- Improve and enhance Data Aggregation and Capacity

In addition, as performance measures increasing become central to CPTC’s strategic goals senior staff may find the following helpful:

A Short Guide to “tipping point” Analysis of Community College Student Labor Market Outcomes (Jenkins, D, 2008, CCRC research Tools No. 3.) New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center.


In the final analysis, the CCRC notes, “The Board (SBCTC) will shortly make some significant changes to the SAI measurement and funding system, based on careful review of data.” This illustrates the point. New paradigms will require CPTC to actively and continually adjust to the changing landscape of measurement and methodology so as to fine-tune its approach to curriculum delivery; it is the performance based, resource constrained, environment we now live in.
Study Session

Call to Order: Chair Lachney called the Board of Trustees study session to order on January 9, 2013, at 3:14 p.m.

Board of Trustees:  
Bruce Lachney, Chair  
Robert Lenigan  
Mark Martinez  
Mary Moss  
Lua Pritchard  

John Walstrom, President

Other Attendees:  
Cat Morris, IT Technician  
Linda Schoonmaker, VP for Finance  
Cherie Steele, Executive Assistant to the President  
Michael Taylor, Director of Information Technology

Discuss Agenda Items for the Board of Trustees Retreat  
Trustees reviewed a draft agenda and made some additions. For the first part of the retreat, trustees will participate in a forum with other attendees from faculty, staff, students, and the community to discuss CPTC’s strategic plan for the next five years.

TACTC Legislative Contact Conference  
The Trustees Association for Community and Technical Colleges (TACTC) Legislative Contact Conference agenda and trustees’ attendance were discussed.

ACCT National Legislative Summit, February 13-16, 2013  
The TACTC office will coordinate visits to Pierce County legislators during the ACCT National Legislative Summit in February. When the final agenda is prepared, it will be forwarded to those attending the summit – President Walstrom and Trustees Moss and Pritchard.

General Discussion  
Trustee Lenigan brought up the subject of railway crossings at major intersections in Lakewood. Trustee Moss urged everyone to continue giving feedback to the Lakewood City Council, as they will evaluate the situation after one year.

Chair Lachney adjourned the study session at 3:49 p.m.
Regular Meeting Agenda

Call to Order: Chair Lachney called the Board of Trustees regular meeting to order on January 9, 2013, at 4:01 p.m.

Board of Trustees:
Bruce Lachney, Chair
Robert Lenigan
Mark Martinez
Mary Moss
Lua Pritchard

John Walstrum, President

Excused Absences: Terry Ryan, Assistant Attorney General

Other Attendees:
Kandi Bauman, Student Engagement Coordinator
Mabel Edmonds, Dean of Workforce Development
Steve Ellis, Dean for Business, Hospitality, Design, and Personal Services
R. J. Hike, Computer Technician
William Jolly, Restaurant Management Instructor
Claire Korschinowski, Student Center Coordinator
Joyce Loveday, Associate Vice President for Instruction
Dean Massey, Culinary Arts Instructor
Cat Morris, IT Technician
Shelley Newman, Pastry Arts Instructor
Jamilea Penn, Associate Dean for Divisions II and IV
Linda Schoonmaker, VP for Finance
Marion Sharp, Campaign Manager
William Siford, ASG Public Relations/Veterans Club
Michelle Simpkins, Dean of Health and Human Services
Kailcen Sparrs, ASG President
June Stacey-Clemons, VP for Student Services
Cherie Steele, Executive Assistant to the President
Michael Taylor, Director of Information Technology
Valerie Sundby-Thorpe, Associate Dean for Instruction

Adoption of the Agenda (Tab 1)
MOTION:
Motion to adopt the Agenda as presented made by Mark Martinez, seconded by Mary Moss. Approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes (Tab 2)
MOTION:
Motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of December 12, 2012, made by Robert Lenigan, seconded by Mark Martinez. Approved unanimously.
President’s Report
WACTC Meeting
Highlights of the monthly Washington Association for Community and Technical Colleges (WACTC) Presidents’ meeting:

- The College is moving forward with an Applied Baccalaureate Degree. President Walstrum is serving on a statewide committee that will create some standards and processes for the development of the degree.
- The presidents are preparing a Capital Budget Plan to talk with legislators, and Vice President Goings is working closely on this.

Washington STEM Holiday Open House 2012
The acronym STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) is one of the great skill gaps in the United States today. President Walstrum attended an event at the McKinley Innovation Center in Seattle, and they discussed how higher education and secondary education can do a better job of producing graduates in these fields.

WDC and WFC Board Joint Holiday Lunch/Meeting
Trustee Martinez and President Walstrum attended the annual holiday meeting of the Workforce Development Center and Workforce Central held at the Pierce County Skills Center. The College currently holds a Nursing Assistant class there and will begin Aerospace Composite classes at the Skills Center in April.

Business Examiner Interview Concerning the Visitors from CAFUC
Chair Lachney and President Walstrum met with some representatives, including the president, from the Civil Aviation Flight University of China. A signing ceremony of the agreement between the institutions was held, photos were taken, and the Business Examiner conducted an interview.

Emergency Management Training
Pierce County Emergency Management personnel held training for approximately 40 people on campus to ensure they are prepared to deal with an emergency of any kind – wind damage, an active shooter, an earthquake, etc.

Community Leaders Regional Meeting
Trustee Martinez and President Walstrum serve on a committee of community leaders, who are working to find more ways to collaborate with other agencies in the county to bring more resources into the county.

Graduation at Purdy
President Walstrum, Vice President Banaszak, Associate Vice President Loveday, and Dean Ellis attended the Cosmetology completion ceremony of sixteen women at the Purdy Corrections Center. President Walstrum commended Dean Ellis and Instructor Barbara Frink for the great work being done at the center.

Strategic Planning
President Walstrum noted that the College will have a kick-off event to begin the strategic planning process on January 14 led by the consultants from College Brain Trust; attendees include trustees, CPTC Foundation directors, business and community partners, people from other educational institutions and CPTC faculty, staff, and students. The project is scheduled for completion in May or June.
Other College Reports
Associated Student Government (ASG) Report (Tab 3)
Claire Korschinowski, Student Center Coordinator, introduced Kandi Bauman, the new Student Engagement Coordinator, who will be working with student government, the Campus Activities Board, and the Peer Mentoring Program.

Kaileen Sparrs, ASG President, presented the ASG Report (Tab 3). The Student Council funded a trip for the Veterans Club to attend the Student Veterans of America National Conference in Florida. President Sparrs introduced Tom Sifford, Public Relations for the Veterans Club, to talk about the trip. The Student Veterans of America is an advocacy group for veterans on campuses across the nation, and the ASG contingency received many resources and ideas for serving the veterans on CPTC’s campuses.

President Walstrom said he has never known a more active or contributing student organization, partly due to the leadership of Vice President Stacey-Clemons and Ms. Korschinowski.

Instruction Report (Tab 4)
Vice President Lori Banaszak introduced Dean Ellis, who spoke very highly about the Culinary Arts Program. He introduced Dean Massey, Culinary Arts Instructor; William Jolley, Restaurant Management Instructor; and Shelley Newman, Pastry Arts Instructor.

Mr. Massey stated that he started the program in 2004 with seven students, and the program has grown to three instructors with a waiting list of students trying to get into the program. Students run the Rainier Room, a realistic fine-dining establishment; they do the cooking, serving, and management operations of the restaurant. A pastry shop, the Bon Sucré, opened this past year and is doing very well.

Trustee Lenigan is a regular patron of the Rainier Room and thinks the McGavick Conference Center’s success is partly due to catering from the Rainier Room. His dream is to have a “hospitality institute” on campus with a program for hotel management, in partnership with Culinary Arts.

Chair’s Report
None

Board Reports and/or Remarks
None

Public Comments
No public comments.

New Business
None

Executive Session
At 4:42 p.m., Chair Lachney stated that, in accordance with RCW 42.30.110, the Board would recess to go into Executive Session for approximately 30 minutes for the purpose of discussing a personnel contract.
Chair Lachney reconvened the Meeting at 5:31 p.m. and asked if there were any action items as a result of Executive Session. There were none.

Adjournment
Chair Lachney adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:31 p.m.

John W. Walstrum, Ph.D.
President
College District Twenty-Nine

Bruce Lachney
Chair, Board of Trustees
College District Twenty-Nine
The five trustees met with approximately 100 other CPTC stakeholders (faculty, students, staff, and representatives from the business community) for the purpose of being involved in a public forum to begin the College’s strategic planning process. The College’s consulting team, College Brain Trust, presented relevant statistics regarding the College’s past year and explained this, the first step in a strategic planning process. The attendees met in small groups, approximately 15 tables, each led by a facilitator to answer three significant questions regarding the College’s future. The trustees selected a table of their choice to be engaged with other stakeholders.

**Board of Trustees Retreat**

5:25-7:00 p.m.
Building 23, Room 212

Call to Order: Chair Lachney called the Board of Trustees Annual Retreat to order on January 14, at 5:25 p.m.

**Board of Trustees:**

Bruce Lachney, Chair
Robert Lenigan
Mark Martinez
Mary Moss
Lua Pritchard

**John Walstrum, President**

**Other Attendees:**

Cherie Steele, Executive Assistant to the President
Jim Tuttle, Chief Human Resources/Legal Affairs Officer

**Strategic Plan**

Since the Strategic Planning Workshop took longer than expected, the Trustees decided to postpone this item.

**Salary Review/Compensation**

At a previous meeting, a trustee asked to have the total cost, including benefits, for each employee. The Finance Department provided an organizational chart with each employee’s total costs printed in red, and President Walstrum distributed a copy to each trustee. This agenda item was postponed until a date is set for the continuation of the Annual Retreat.
CEO Evaluation
After some discussion, it was decided to use the same CEO evaluation process as last year. Chair Lachney asked trustees to review last year’s evaluation; no changes were recommended. Cherie Steele will send the form to the trustees for their input, compile the results, and complete a final evaluation by the March Board of Trustees meeting.

In light of President Walstrum’s announcement of his retirement in September 2013, the trustees discussed some possible considerations for the upcoming presidential search. To make the process as transparent as possible, Chair Lachney will send an email requesting input from faculty, staff, and students as to how they would like to see the process proceed. People can respond via email through Jim Tuttle or by speaking during the Public Comments section at the February 6 Board of Trustees meeting.

After February 6, Jim Tuttle will compile the suggestions he has received for the search process and report to Chair Lachney. At that point, trustees will decide on a process, which may involve sending out a proposal to contract with a consultant, selecting a committee, and setting deadlines.

Due to the late hour, it was decided to postpone the remainder of agenda items until a continuation of the Annual Retreat:

Budget 2013-14
Collective Bargaining Contractual Obligation
Capital Budget Process/Options
Regional Planning Effort
New Projects

Adjournment
Chair Lachney adjourned the Annual Retreat at 7:09 p.m.

John W. Walstrum, Ph.D.
President
College District Twenty-Nine

Bruce Lachney
Chair, Board of Trustees
College District Twenty-Nine
Peer Mentors

The Vice President of Student Success held her first event to celebrate the accomplishments of our volunteer peer mentors and participants in our service learning projects. The appreciation bowling event was held at Narrows Bowl in University Place, and was attended by 17 students. Certificates of appreciation were given to volunteers whom had completed 10 or more hours of service to their fellow students, and a trophy was given to the student with the days best bowling score. Tanya LeVang stood out among the rest, completing more than 35 volunteer hours in one quarter. She is being recognized as the “Mentor of the Quarter.”

Service Learning

Our Lead Peer Mentors lent their hands and time to assist the Service Learning Center with this year’s Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. week of service. While the project itself was coordinated by the campus Service Learning Specialist Kay Porter, our Lead Peer Mentors staffed tables where students had the opportunity to write letters to the troops. Our Lead Peer Mentors each coordinate their own service learning projects each quarter, providing opportunities for students to directly work in the community providing a wide variety of services. We are looking forward to this quarter’s Peer Mentoring service learning opportunities!
CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Our Clubs and Organizations Senator Kevin Duval has been hard at work holding Club Committee meetings, bringing a sense of community, additional leadership services and training to all clubs and organizations sanctioned under the ASG.

Currently he is working with the clubs and organizations to hold an joint venture event, with the goal of increasing participation in student clubs and organizations. Clubs and organizations are an amazing, and very relevant way for students to get involved in the campus community, and often making important connections with the community at large.

CPTC AND WACTCSA

ASCPTC President and WACTCSA Chair Kailene Sparrs along with ASCPTC VP of Student Activities Nate Oelrich testified to the House Higher Education Committee on the first day of the 2013 Legislative Session. They presented the 2013 legislative agenda for WACTCSA, which included “Redefining Basic Education” and “Regulation of Data Reporting Standards,” which were well received by the committee.
FY2012-2013

2nd Quarter
Period Ending
December 31, 2012

February 1, 2013

Prepared by:
Finance Department
### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>State Allocations</td>
<td>14,573,846</td>
<td>6,583,262</td>
<td>7,990,584</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08A</td>
<td>Education Legacy Trust</td>
<td>1,182,064</td>
<td>511,185</td>
<td>670,879</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Local Dedicated</td>
<td>3,946,086</td>
<td>496,197</td>
<td>3,449,889</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Operating Fees/Tuition</td>
<td>8,970,563</td>
<td>7,736,057</td>
<td>1,234,506</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operating Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,672,559</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,326,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,345,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>5,795,204</td>
<td>1,635,877</td>
<td>4,159,327</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
<td>2,300,532</td>
<td>(625,532)</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Associated Students</td>
<td>614,363</td>
<td>541,558</td>
<td>72,805</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
<td>613,600</td>
<td>626,400</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>155,402</td>
<td>87,837</td>
<td>67,565</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Other Enterprise</td>
<td>722,210</td>
<td>421,231</td>
<td>300,979</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>Grants in Aid</td>
<td>6,943,762</td>
<td>6,141,305</td>
<td>802,457</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>Student Loan</td>
<td>6,677,417</td>
<td>4,776,566</td>
<td>1,900,751</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>CPTC Financial Aid</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>312,402</td>
<td>247,598</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,383,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,833,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,550,349</strong></td>
<td><strong>69%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>State Capital Projects</td>
<td>15,616,119</td>
<td>15,402,928</td>
<td>213,191</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,744,479</td>
<td>840,856</td>
<td>903,623</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capital Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,360,598</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,243,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,116,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,416,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,401,495</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operating Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,672,559</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,326,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,345,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>5,801,781</td>
<td>1,831,579</td>
<td>3,970,202</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>2,657,000</td>
<td>1,851,735</td>
<td>715,265</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Associated Students</td>
<td>688,813</td>
<td>537,759</td>
<td>131,054</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>1,338,034</td>
<td>700,022</td>
<td>636,012</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>764,231</td>
<td>722,315</td>
<td>41,916</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Other Enterprise</td>
<td>895,069</td>
<td>582,574</td>
<td>312,495</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>Grants in Aid</td>
<td>7,008,327</td>
<td>6,879,666</td>
<td>128,661</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>Student Loan</td>
<td>6,577,417</td>
<td>4,686,172</td>
<td>1,890,245</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>CPTC Financial Aid</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>61,911</td>
<td>498,089</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,278,672</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,035,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,242,939</strong></td>
<td><strong>69%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>State Capital Projects</td>
<td>15,616,119</td>
<td>15,402,928</td>
<td>213,191</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,744,479</td>
<td>840,856</td>
<td>903,623</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capital Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,360,598</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,243,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,116,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,873,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,559,742</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>%Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td>28,193,784</td>
<td>17,404,883</td>
<td>10,786,901</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>25,479,673</td>
<td>12,743,371</td>
<td>12,736,302</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capital Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>4,482,812</td>
<td>1,403,946</td>
<td>3,078,866</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>58,156,269</td>
<td>31,552,200</td>
<td>26,604,069</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a percent of this year 83% 65%

Source: CPTC Budget Status district by Fund (8A1213)
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Operating Funds 001/08A/148/149

By Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Index</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
<th>PY to Date</th>
<th>% of LYTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010 Instruction</td>
<td>12,830,198</td>
<td>5,978,973</td>
<td>6,851,225</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>8,024,005</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040 Primary Support Services</td>
<td>3,577,943</td>
<td>1,828,998</td>
<td>1,748,945</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>1,152,305</td>
<td>159%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050 Libraries</td>
<td>465,867</td>
<td>226,850</td>
<td>239,017</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>227,450</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060 Student Services</td>
<td>3,347,445</td>
<td>1,630,444</td>
<td>1,717,001</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>1,647,368</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080 Institutional Support</td>
<td>6,046,971</td>
<td>3,067,382</td>
<td>2,979,589</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>3,716,453</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090 Plant and Facilities</td>
<td>2,966,045</td>
<td>1,547,576</td>
<td>1,418,467</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>2,097,821</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,234,469</td>
<td>14,280,225</td>
<td>14,954,244</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>14,765,392</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
<th>PY to Date</th>
<th>% of LYTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>16,360,829</td>
<td>7,717,170</td>
<td>8,643,659</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>7,639,579</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Employee Benefits</td>
<td>5,301,060</td>
<td>2,642,225</td>
<td>3,158,835</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>2,765,524</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Personal Services</td>
<td>205,518</td>
<td>207,201</td>
<td>(683)</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
<td>160,387</td>
<td>129%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>5,011,621</td>
<td>3,084,174</td>
<td>1,927,447</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>2,276,461</td>
<td>135%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Travel</td>
<td>154,480</td>
<td>68,144</td>
<td>86,336</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>194,387</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Capital Outlays</td>
<td>(174,887)</td>
<td>(340,485)</td>
<td>165,598</td>
<td>194.7%</td>
<td>902,689</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Computers/Software</td>
<td>369,642</td>
<td>503,086</td>
<td>(193,444)</td>
<td>162.5%</td>
<td>68,623</td>
<td>733%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Grants to Students</td>
<td>16,908</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>10,736</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Debt Service</td>
<td>908,228</td>
<td>152,181</td>
<td>756,047</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>323,529</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Transfers</td>
<td>640,070</td>
<td>242,811</td>
<td>397,259</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>423,478</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,234,469</td>
<td>14,280,225</td>
<td>14,954,244</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>14,765,392</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Massage Studies

Program Presentation
Did you know?

- Massage Studies provides one of the fastest tracks into the medical professions
- Massage Practitioners are licensed by the Department of Health
- Medically necessary massage is often covered by medical insurance
- CPTC’s Massage Studies program provides more in depth preparation for employment in the field that the majority of programs in the State
- Our students are trained in clinical massage including assessment and treatment of common injuries and conditions
Our Program reaches out to potential students by:

- Offering an evening program with part-time hours or
- A fast track full time day program providing the straightest path to degree completion
- Beginning to look to the future of on-line access
Massage Studies strives for excellence and student success!

St. Clare Hospital
Success today is a job tomorrow!

- Our job board posts openings that range from $15.00- $30.00 per hour
- Medical Massage is expected to continue its growth over the next 8-10 years
- Massage therapy provides versatility in employment options from medical settings to race tracks, yes race tracks!
Employment Options
Where do our graduates find work?

- Chiropractic Offices
- Apple and other Physical Therapy Clinics
- Hospitals
- Spa Settings
- Corporate Offices (Seated chair massage)
- Massage Envy locations
- In their own businesses
- Opportunities exist to be an employee or a business owner