

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

APPROVED

**Meeting of April 14, 2010
1:00 PM—City College, Room L-113**

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Joyce Allen	Classified Senate President—Miramar College (proxy for Sam Shooshtary)
Lou Ascione	Dean of Liberal Arts—Miramar College (proxy for Susan Schwarz)
M. Salley Deaton	Academic Representative—City College
Daphne Figueroa	Academic Senate President—Miramar College
Cathy Hasson	Director, Institutional Research and Planning—District Office
Otto Lee	Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services and Planning—District Office
Cynthia Rico Bravo	Academic Senate President—Mesa College
Ray Ramirez	Dean—Continuing Education—ECC

ABSENT:

Mary Benard	Vice President of Instruction—City College
June Cressy	Classified Senate President—City College
Franchesca Gade	Student Trustee
Barbara Kavalier	Vice President of Student Services—Mesa College
Tim McGrath	Vice President of Instruction—Mesa College
Esther Matthew	Academic Senate President—Continuing Education
Susan Schwarz	Dean of Library & Technology—Miramar College
Sam Shooshtary	Classified Senate Past President—Miramar College
Charlene Shurtleff	Classified Senate Vice President—Continuing Education—North City

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 1:16 p.m.

I. Integrated Planning Model for Accreditation

Otto Lee gave the committee a handout featuring the integrated planning model for accreditation that was developed with accreditation leaders, the Chancellor's Cabinet, and other shared governance bodies. Salley Deaton expressed her concern that the model diminishes the idea that the District supports the Colleges. Cynthia Rico Bravo agreed, stating that it feels as if the Colleges are off-sites of the District. Lee responded that creation of this model was not solely District-driven. This handout is just for the information of the committee, and recommended that any input be directed to the college accreditation teams.

II. Approval of March 4, 2010 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

M/S/P (Rico Bravo/Ramirez)

III. Results of Self-Assessment on Shared Governance Structure (Cathy Hasson)

Cathy Hasson reminded the committee that at the last meeting, she had presented the self assessment that all District wide shared governance committees were undergoing. This is not an evaluation of the committee itself, so much as an evaluation of its contributions. 7 people responded to the survey, though many did not leave comments. Hasson is hoping to review the committee's contributions and recommended actions in order to add more feedback.

The committee reviewed the report, discussing its concerns and suggestions. Hasson recommended adding the Strategic Plan and the companion evaluation plan the committee is currently generating as accomplishments.

Hasson agreed to send an updated feedback report to Lee, who would then forward it to the rest of the committee for review.

IV. Review of Metrics Data

Lee announced that his main agenda item today is to have a discussion about the assessment portion of what the committee is doing, and to produce an update from the committee (that will go through all the shared governance bodies) of the committee's annual update to the Strategic Plan.

Format wise, Lee believes that the Board and the committee's stakeholders are looking for some kind of narrative about a page or two in length that gives a picture of what we think is happening. He has created a rough draft of this narrative by distilling some of the data found in the committee's evaluation plan binders. He presented this draft to the committee. This is his observation of some of the discussions that we have had within the committee as well as some broader discussions that he has had with other shared governance committees.

His focus in creating this update is to look at the overarching considerations, the external factors influencing what the District and College are doing. He wants to

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

make sure that the goals still make sense when viewed alongside what is going on at the campuses. To date, he has not received feedback indicating that any of the goals are no longer appropriate to all of the institutions.

The budget crisis is a factor that we want to mention; tied to that is how various groups are reacting to the budget. For example, many student services departments are in “maintenance mode” trying to keep up with the current demand for their services; in this environment, it is difficult to expand into new areas.

Deaton recommended focusing on what departments have been able to accomplish despite the cuts; it is still possible to do new and innovative things that don’t directly involve more money. It is also possible to pursue grant money and other alternative funding sources. As the accrediting bodies say, not having money is not an excuse not to meet our requirements. This is an opportunity to get rid of “dead wood” in terms of prioritizing what is important and making operations more efficient. Lee agreed that we can look at this as an opportunity rather than a crisis.

Lee’s last consideration in creating the draft is to creating a baseline of data; next year will be our opportunity to look at new data and compare our progress.

Hasson mentioned that heightened accountability is a factor that drives a lot of our decisions as we are increasingly encountering demands from our community and legislatures. We are required to focus on evidence, which creates more work, but gives us more legitimacy. Deaton agreed; the access to data that has been required has allowed her for the first time to provide evidence regarding the effect of data on retention and grade point average, allowing her to identify more grants to pursue. Ultimately, this has increased her ability to help her students, particularly those most at risk.

The committee reviewed the goals and the distilled data. Lee asked for feedback as to what kinds of data are especially pertinent and should be incorporated. For the most part, Lee looked at data at the District level, assuming the individual institutions were tracking their own benchmark data.

For the first goal, the committee discussed the increase in transfer rates and the strong linkages with K-12. This provides us with a baseline of where we need to go. Lee added that we have many, many partnership collaborations with SDUSD. Bravo asked about including information about the outreach that we do, including memorandums of understanding with various private colleges and universities. Lee responded we might not have had this specific information available when creating the evaluation plan, but if those numbers are a focus for the colleges, we can definitely work on integrating them. For example, we can try and include the total number of MOUs. Lou Ascione recommended adding fill rates; even given the cut sections and the limited budget, the faculty have done a phenomenal job at filling the class sections.

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

The committee next skipped to goal 3, which deals with regional workforce development. He listed the amounts we have in grants and stimulus dollars, and discussed student completion rates.

Next, the committee discussed Goal 4, professional development. Lee discussed the leadership academies and other programs the District Office has established. He also asked the classified senate presidents about the kinds of programs the colleges are offered. Deaton mentioned that City has a convocation for classified staff every year. They are also trying to include the classified staff in the shared governance process; since they often have the first contact with the students, it is often overlooked the amount of knowledge they have. Rico Bravo mentioned that Mesa has one as well. Lee added the two day staff development workshops that took place during spring break, which they made available to staff from other campuses as well. Joyce Allen added that Miramar does not have anything at this time, but are hoping to add a mentoring program in the future, helping to establish pathways from classified to supervisory and give people an understanding of what they might expect. Rico Bravo agreed that the budget is being balanced on the back of staff, so any development we can give them would be beneficial.

The committee moved on to goal 5, sustainability. Lee discussed the LEED certification of the new buildings, the best practices we are implementing to reduce our carbon footprint, etc. Ray Ramirez added that during the recession, green jobs increased by 5% despite the losses nationwide. Lee also discussed curriculum relating to sustainability, including new programs and certificates created using federal funding.

Goal 6 was discussed next, budget development. Lee mentioned that the District is currently trying to make up deficit spending through one-time funding and alternative sources; this is reasonable given the cuts the state has imposed. Though our goals were to boost reserves and avoid deficit spending, the current crisis has not allowed for that. Ramirez recommended focusing on how we are doing compared to many districts in the state.

Lee is waiting on more information for Goal 7 from the site public information officers and Rich Dittbenner. This will be passed on as soon as it is received. Daphne Figueroa recommended including information about the changes to the class schedule; to date, the District has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars with the new format. Ascione also discussed Miramar's new institutional effectiveness cycle, which has been highly effective. Ramirez recommended looking into pursuing more endowments, bequeaths, and other such alternative sources. Lee stated that the individual foundations are looking into pursuing such revenue streams.

Lee asked if the committee would feel comfortable if he worked on creating a narrative from the bullets listed, incorporating the committee's suggestions. Cynthia Rico Bravo asked to include an update of outreach numbers for the District, which Lynn Neault has available. Lee agreed to track that data down.

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

V. Standing Item-Updates on Campus Planning (Colleges & C.E.)

Lee invited Continuing Education to present their update. Ramirez announced that the newest Strategic Plan for Continuing Education is on its way to approval. This has gone through an extensive development process including appreciative inquiry. He feels that the District plan compares to and aligns with the CE plan. He will bring a comparison of this strategic plan with others in the state to a future meeting. He shared updated data about Continuing Ed enrollment and class size.

Deaton presented City's update. She passed out two handouts. The first was City's mission and goals statements. For the first time, these have not been revised from the previous year (to ensure the priorities were consistent for accreditation). The second was a statement of City's priorities (and how the District Strategic Plan objectives correspond to each, as applicable).

Deaton stressed how City looks at accreditation as part of their planning process. They see it their largest evaluation. They are creating a "things to do" list to make sure that they complete all the tasks they start. City is also working to integrate the planning processes of the various departments into one cohesive process (and ultimately into the master plan).

Lee thanked Deaton for her work in showing the correspondence between the two strategic plans. Rico Bravo clarified that this is the kind of feedback that Lee is looking for in terms of how the college and district goals match; her understanding was that he is looking for how college goals match the District plan. Deaton responded that their end product was based on their philosophy that since the colleges get accredited and serve a unique community, the District should support them, therefore District goals should support college goals. Lee stressed that the most important part of the exercise is to ensure that though not every college goal may be in the District Strategic Plan, there should be nothing in the Plan that is not reflected at the colleges.

Figuroa presented Miramar's updated. As Ascione mentioned, Miramar is going through their integrated planning model. They are very happy with how it is going, and that it is being used. Figuroa is particularly excited about the integration of the budget process; for the first time, it is transparent to the rest of the college. They are also updating their educational master plan (last fully updated during the last accreditation cycle), including reviewing and refining their program review and SLOAC processes. They have created their own SLOAC tracking system, which they feel is working very well.

Figuroa continued to discuss some of the specific goals. For Goal 2, Miramar is in the process of relooking at everything. They have lost a lot of categorical grants, so they are trying to come up with new ways to helps students. They are having a large number of forums including students and faculty to look at ways to best continue to serve and support students.

Rico Bravo presented Mesa's update. Mesa is currently working on a rubric to show the comparison of District and College goals. They are currently facing some challenges in helping students transfer to other colleges, especially given the

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee

recent difficulties with SDSU. They are encouraging students to look at other schools and pursue other alternatives. They are focusing on their outreach, and were recently able to host their 3rd annual African American/Latino summit despite a lack of funding; they were able to get over \$20,000 by working with outside organizations. She also discussed other grants and resources that Mesa is currently pursuing and developing despite the budget challenges.

One of the challenges Mesa is currently facing is the lack of documentation about its processes and procedures as they go through accreditation. They are trying to change a culture of “this is how we did it in the past” to one that is more thorough and documented.

Rico Bravo concluding by asking for more time to adopt a rubric comparing the Strategic goals. Lee reiterated that the most important consideration is the District goals are still applicable to the college goals. Ramirez praised Deaton’s handout, and suggested all the campuses adopt something similar so there was a tangible comparison available.

Lee wrapped up the meeting by discussing Goal 2. There are currently little data available, as the Student Services Council has insisted that they should drive the data and its indicators; however, with the current budget issues it will be difficult for them to get to this. This has led to a void in the data. Lee is asking for the committee’s help in lobbying Student Services personnel to help with this so that we can get the section filled in and move forward in our evaluation. The Student Services Committee has expressed that they are not comfortable with this committee determining which data to use.

VI. Announcements

- A. The May 6th Strategic Planning meeting will be held at Miramar College, Room A-201A.
- B. Handouts:
 - 1. April 14, 2010 Meeting Agenda
 - 2. March 4, 2010 Minutes

VII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.