

# San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

**APPROVED**

Meeting of October 26, 2009  
2:00 PM—Mesa College, LRC-208

## MINUTES

### **PRESENT:**

Mary Benard	Vice President of Instruction—City College
Yvonne Bergland	Dean of Instructional Services—Mesa College
M. Salley Deaton	Academic Representative—City College
Daphne Figueroa	Academic Senate President—Miramar College
Cathy Hasson	Director, Institutional Research and Planning—District Office
Barbara Kavalier	Vice President of Student Services—Mesa College
Otto Lee	Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services and Planning—District Office
Ray Ramirez	Dean—Continuing Education—ECC
Susan Schwarz	Dean of Library & Technology—Miramar College
Sam Shoostary	Classified Senate Past President—Miramar College
Charlene Shurtleff	Classified Senate Vice President—Continuing Education—North City

### **ABSENT:**

June Cressy	Classified Senate President—City College
Esther Matthew	Academic Senate President—Continuing Education
Cynthia Rico Bravo	Academic Senate President—Mesa College

### **STAFF:**

Amanda Ficken-Davis Acting Administrative Assistant, Instructional Services—District Office

# San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

*Otto Lee called the meeting to order at 2:10p.m.*

## **I. Welcome and Introductions**

Otto Lee welcomed everyone to the 2009-2010 kickoff meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee. He asked the committee members to introduce themselves.

Following introductions, Lee explained that the strategic plan has been a multiple year effort to produce an accurate reflection of what is going on at the different institutions in the District. Now that a plan is in place, the committee must begin to look at the next steps, monitoring and assessment of our goals and objectives.

## **II. Approval of May 15, 2009 Minutes**

<i>The minutes were approved. (5 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions)</i>	<i>M/S/P (Benard/Kavalier)</i>
---	--------------------------------

## **III. Strategic Plan Evangelists—Accreditation (Otto)**

Lee informed the committee that in the past, the District had received many comments from accreditation regarding the need for an integrated strategic plan between continuing education and the colleges, including the need for monitoring and metrics. The colleges and this committee are now in the process of addressing the need for integrated planning as a way of budgeting and allocating resources. Within that process, Lee has noticed that the Strategic Plan is not as prevalent as the committee might like even though it is a crucial part of the accreditation piece.

Lee emphasized that he is asking the committee members to be advocates of the Strategic Plan, and to lead the way in articulating and encouraging the use of the Strategic Plan. They should be able to answer questions and explain the process of how the committee arrived at this document. He reminded the committee that they had collected the goals, objectives, and priorities of each of the institutions. They identified those that were common to create the District's goals and objectives. They are not greatly detailed, but instead are broad enough so each college can use them and still keep with their individual mission.

Lee said he hopes the committee can use this to help the accreditation teams, and asked if there was anything that can be done to help with the accreditation component.

Salley Deaton stated her belief that unlike the colleges, where the various departments work together, the District is very siloed. She would like to see more integration between District departments. For example, while Terry Davis has

# San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

done a great job dealing with the budget crisis the District is facing, it seems that the District Office just hands down mandates, as opposed to the college administrative services department, which works with the campus' continuous cycle of improvement in budget development.

Lee responded that he understands the issues facing the colleges and will continue working with the district level committees to address them, and hopefully break the cycle.

## **IV. Timeline for Updates (All)**

Lee asked the committee members to present and update and timeline of the individual institution's strategic planning efforts. According to the cycle published in the Strategic Plan, objectives need to be updated in the Spring. Lee would like to the committee to continue to get updates from the colleges in order to be able to reconcile and amend the strategic plan as necessary. This will be a standing agenda item.

Lee first invited City College to present their updates. Deaton presented two handouts. The first was a chart showing City's annual program review, planning, budget development and resource oversight process, and how it tied into the larger District Strategic Planning Process. Deaton explained the chart and its creation in detail. She told the committee how the Instructional, Business, and Student Services department were working together on the academic plan, which in turn fed other school and departmental plans.

The second handout mapped how City has integrated the District Strategic Plan into City College goals. Not all goals match.

Cathy Hasson complimented the work that Deaton had done on these handouts. She recommended adding the research agenda into the Internal Assessment component.

Lee explained that he understands there is not always full alignment between the District plan and those of the colleges; the goal is to have a plan that is broad and flexible enough to accommodate the goals and missions of all the institutions.

Mary Benard added that City is weaving assessment of Student Learning Outcomes into the program review and master plan cycles. City has been trying to learn from where other colleges have been "dinged" in accreditation and integrate recommended changes in now. Since purchasing the TaskStream program, it has become a great tool to assist in this process. City College is working to add the academic planning component into the process, a piece that has been missing in the past.

## San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

Deaton added that they are working to get everyone involved in the process to make sure goals are common and attainable.

Hasson informed Deaton and Benard that accreditation looks for continuity, so they may want to make sure that the Academic Senate and others are aware of these handouts and can reference them to the accreditation committee.

Benard assured her it had been distributed at the meetings of most on campus committees. As City makes new plans, they are making sure they review these handouts and see where their plans fit in.

Lee next invited Mesa College to present their updates. Yvonne Bergland first presented Mesa's mission, vision, and values statement. She informed the committee they approved this statement at the last President's Cabinet meeting. It has gone through the shared governance process. The Goals were developed at the annual Cabinet retreat.

Bergland next presented the integrated planning framework, which linked their planning process to resource allocation. The process supports the new mission, vision, and values statement, as well as the education master plan created in 2007, and the current strategic plan. The program review process in an integrated review (Student Services, Administrative Services, and Instructional Services programs use the same process) in a 5 year cycle.

Bergland discussed several other handouts that show the link between planning and resource allocation (which had formerly been unclear). The final handout is an overview of the Pilot program that Mesa is currently undergoing so they will have implementation information for accreditation. Bergland explained the process of this program and the role the Resource Allocation Committee will play.

Hasson stated she had some questions which will likely be asked by the accreditation committee. First, are the Resource Allocation Committee members receiving a prioritized list? Bergland responded that the Academic Affairs Committee will be creating the instrument based on established criteria and based upon the program review documentation. Hasson recommended preparing written criteria and a rubric for the accreditation committee to review.

Ray Ramirez asked if the Instructional programs, Student Services and Administrative review were new, or if they had been a part of earlier cycles. Bergland responded this was the first cycle that included these components. Ramirez continued to ask if there were separate copies of evaluation instruments for the different types of programs. Bergland answered that there was one generic instrument for all 3 types; there are instructions that direct the different divisions as how to respond.

## San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

Lee thanked Bergland for her presentation, and recommended Mesa look into performance indicators tied to their goals. Bergland responded that Mesa has performance indicators that are an integral part of their planning process and are used as metrics for their goals. He next invited Miramar to present their updates

Daphne Figueroa presented the first of her handouts, a cyclical diagram illustrating an overview of the San Diego Miramar College Planning Cycle. An accompanying timeline gave more detailed information about each step. Figueroa explained each step of the planning cycle to the committee. Like Mesa, Miramar had just reviewed their mission statement, but decided not to change it at this time.

Susan Schwarz informed the committee that the College plan has incorporated District and State strategic goals. Their cycle reviews the priorities and goals; while they may not map to exact goals, there are connections.

Hasson asked if part of the completion of assessment portion includes reviewing the information for planning purposes, or if that takes place later.

Schwarz responded that yes, the review takes place when the environmental scan is completed in September.

Hasson clarified that typically the review occurs at the other end of the cycle after implementation. That piece needs to be added, likely to the review end which will feed into the revision cycle. This review is made up of the research agenda (which is the college wide performance measurement system) which should be located somewhere in the timeline where the research agenda is reviewed and then set for the following year. This process is similar to the environmental scan. Hasson would like to clarify if the environmental scan on the timeline is when it is assembled, or when previous data is reviewed. Figueroa responded that this is when it is put together. It is reviewed around November, when it goes to the College wide forums. Hasson recommended that a formal environmental scan review step be added to help reveal when revisions are made. Figueroa responded that Miramar is working on it, even if it is not part of the plan; the research committee chair is new, and this diagram was not developed through the research committee. She will take this suggestion back to the committee.

Lee believes that for now this overview is good; what is important is there is a general overview of the cycle and its components. Since there is consistency between the three colleges in the components and in the integration, things are moving in the right direction. Lee believes that Hasson is looking at specific pieces and making sure we are clear on what instrument and guidance we will be using, and clarifying that for presentation for accreditation.

Lee then invited Continuing Education to present their update. Ramirez informed the committee that before the District Strategic Plan, continuing education did not have a strategic plan. They have created a cycle based on their best efforts, but

## San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

for cycle one (which started last Fall) will not be completed until the end of this semester. Program review for all programs (including Student Services and possible administrative services) will kick off cycle 2. Like City and Mesa, Continuing Education has software which assists them in their planning process.

Ramirez led the committee through the Continuing Ed's planning cycle. Before this, program review has been virtually nonexistent. They now have a research committee and a draft of an educational master plan. They are excited to start the process.

Ramirez pointed out some of the ironies of the process. For example, one of the goals is to grow enrollment; the District is now struggling to keep its enrollment from growing beyond state reimbursement. As a result, they are trying to keep their goals broad enough to allow for emergent strategies as circumstances change.

Lee thanked everyone for their presentations. He appreciates that this committee has always been able to share tips and techniques across the institutions. He reiterated that this will be a standing item.

Barbara Kavalier mentioned that at a recent district-wide Accreditation committee meeting, there was a focus on aligning District resources. She came away from this meeting unsure of what the next step is. Is this something that this committee should be working on?

Bergland agreed that she was unclear about where to go next. Lee stated that he had the same reaction. His observation was that with accreditation there were some specific questions, but the presentation was geared more towards what Business Services does. His reaction is also that there is no real next step to be taken at this time. Based on his time working with Terry Davis, he feels that the best way to move forward is for Accreditation leadership is to develop specific questions and request specific information to make sure we have the questions the accreditation teams will need.

Deaton expressed her concern that there is a major disconnect with the District over the accreditation process. They do not understand how integrate the campuses have to be. She feels that the District largely tells the colleges what to do, instead of supporting and working with the colleges to support their needs. She is concerned that while Student Learning Outcomes are a major focus of accreditation, there is little information from the District stating how their work supports student learning.

Bergland stated her concern that the colleges have not received several pieces of information requested from various District offices that they need to complete their self study. Lee responded that Lynn Neault is working to collect that

## **San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee**

information; he gave his piece to her a couple of weeks ago. Hasson echoed that she had given her piece to Lynn recently as well.

Lee agreed that these are important points. He suggested keeping this information in mind when the accreditation leaders meet next, and coming up with specific questions or requesting specific information from District leaders. While he agrees with Deaton that there is a disconnect because the District isn't accredited, we also can't respond if we don't know what specifically the colleges are looking for. We are all committed to successful accreditation.

Bergland acknowledged that she found it very helpful to have district wide meetings with the Board, HR, etc. While liked the budget presentation was very informative, she was concerned that it gave the impression that budget drove planning, not the other way around. That is one example of the disconnects. Lee reiterated that these are good issues to bring up at the next accreditation meeting.

### **V. Performance Indicators/Research Agenda (Cathy Hasson)**

Lee remarked that he was pleased that assessment was an integral part in all of the college plans. The question now is how do we look at assessment and performance indicators for the District wide plan? The ground rule we must adhere to is not developing performance indicators or assessments that are specifically for this plan; rather we need to identify data that would be helpful for college use and roll those into the District plan. If a specific goal only has standalone indicators that do not assist the colleges and require substantial monitoring, then these goals probably do not belong in the Strategic Plan.

Deaton asked if Hasson has created a research agenda for all of the colleges. Hasson responded she had only done one for Miramar and City. Mesa has one, but it is different in terms of format.

Hasson told the Council that she met with Lee and spoke about putting something together that would make sense not only for a District wide strategic plan, but would also fit into the college environment and measure things that would make sense to the colleges. She used the same concept of a research agenda to help organize the goals and objects and ties them to performance indicators, and keep track of them and measure them, along with creating a potential outcomes report that could be looked at on an annual basis.

Hasson then presented her draft; because this is a three year plan, this has three years worth of indicators that will hopefully carry over from year to year. These objectives are measured at the objective level, not at the campus level, although a lot of the information is what is being measured at the college. There are several ways to look at several of the objectives; where possible, she has plugged that information into this grid. There are several blanks within the form that are

## San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

unknowns where the committee needs to identify possible ways to measure these objectives.

Kavalier asked if there is anything to control for the fact that the number of high school students will be dropping. Hasson responded that this is just the agenda; it will likely be accompanied by an outcome report that would explain the information and account for variables either on an annual or 3 year basis.

Deaton asked if there was a way to color code the reports that are run to see if there is an overlap between the colleges as to who is using what reports or other information. This could help identify metrics.

Hasson reiterated this is a start; there is a lot of work to be done and information to fill in. Those groups and committees involved in the areas the objectives stress would likely be able to identify what information is needed.

Lee informed the committee that this is just to introduce the idea of a research agenda to the committee. If they agree this is the way they want to go, the committee can then go to other groups and invite them in for a dialogue to populate the other areas.

Ramirez asked if this would be the main research agenda for the District, or would there be others. Hasson responded the college wide research agendas are linked directly to their goals, but there are cascading agendas as well to focus on specific areas. This particular one would be linked to the District wide Strategic Plan.

Ramirez mentioned a prior report that was done with respect to other plans; would this stop those kinds of reports? Hasson responded that these agendas are seen as driving the research committee; other requests are considered ad hoc, though not necessarily any less important.

Ramirez referenced TaskStream and other planning software that was discussed earlier in the meeting. Is there any plan to buy this kind of software for the District? Hasson responded no, not to her knowledge. More than anything, this research agenda is an organizing tool and provides the opportunity to have some rich dialogue and build that collaborative inquiry that the committee has discussed. The next step is to work on benchmarking, such as success rates, and establish District standards and goals. What comes out of this is more critical.

Lee asked if there is a way to present this concept to other groups in a way that conveys its potential. Hasson recommended a “scorecard” example that is based on benchmarking and developing standards. It is an outcome report with narration that is user friendly and gives the potential for rich dialogue. Lee asked if an example could be sent to the committee for review.



# San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

For the next meeting, Lee asked people to look at the research agenda and the scorecard and reflect upon it so the committee can decide which way we want to go and what data is available so we can examine the data we have relative to our goals. He asked the group to think about the blank fields and try to identify what we can use to populate it, or which campus committees we should ask so we can start populating the list.

## **VI. Announcements**

### A. Handouts:

1. October 26, 2009 Meeting Agenda
2. May 15, 2009 Minutes
3. College Handouts-City, Mesa, Miramar

## **VII. Adjournment**

*Meeting adjourned at 3:54p.m.*