

**San Diego Community College District
Strategic Planning Committee
Technical Working Group**

APPROVED

**Meeting of May 15, 2009
3:00 PM—District Office, Room 245**

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Mary Benard	Vice President of Instruction—City College
M. Salley Deaton	Academic Representative—City College
P. Darrel Harrison	Academic Senate President—Miramar College
Barbara Kavalier	Vice President of Student Services—Mesa College
Otto Lee	Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services and Planning—District Office
Esther Matthew	Academic Senate President—Continuing Education
Sam Shooshtary	Classified Senate President—Miramar College
Terrie Teegarden	Academic Senate President—Mesa College

ABSENT:

Yvonne Bergland	Dean of Instructional Services—Mesa College
June Cressy	Classified Senate President—City College
Ray Ramirez	Dean—Continuing Education—ECC
Marina Rosales	Classified Senate Vice President—Continuing Education—North City
Susan Schwarz	Dean of Library & Technology—Miramar College

STAFF:

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

GUESTS:

Cathy Hasson	Director, Institutional Research and Planning—District Office
--------------	---

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee Technical Working Group

Otto Lee called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Otto Lee asked members of the committee to introduce themselves. He commended them on their efforts and hard work in pulling the Strategic Plan together. The final product has been very well received.

II. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 3, 2008 MINUTES

Lee asked the committee members to review the draft minutes they had received and to send any changes to Amanda Ficken. As not all committee members are present, minutes will be voted on electronically following the meeting.

III. PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

Lee informed the committee that he hopes to start the next phase of the strategic plan: an annual cycle of updating the plan based on input from the Colleges, Continuing Education, and appropriate committees. He explained how the committee would look at the available data and metrics to assess our actions, and adjust the goals and objectives accordingly. He does not feel it is this committee's responsibility to monitor the data, but rather to evaluate it and decide what goals have been completed and what needs to be updated. In today's meeting he would like to focus on setting up the framework of how this will happen.

IV. TIMELINE FOR UPDATES

Lee referred the committee to page 8 of the published Strategic Plan, which charts the desired annual District strategic planning process timeline. He acknowledged that each college may go through the process using different timelines; today, he would like to find out what the timeline used by each college is to adjust the overall plan accordingly.

Mary Benard told the committee that at City, the timeline is very similar, but the dates are a little off. According to the published chart, plans are updated and revised over the summer; this is hard to do, as the majority of the faculty are not usually around in the summer; planning usually begins with the faculty's return in the fall. Darrel Harrison agreed that Miramar generally goes through this part of the process in the fall (generally September/October).

Barbara Kavalier asked if the District's timeline needed to align with that of the colleges. Harrison responded that if the District is depending on the colleges for information, it pretty much has to.

Terrie Teegarden added that assessment, which the timeline says happens in February and March, usually takes place in April, with all updating and revision taking place when the faculty returns. It seems that the whole timeline needs to rotate to match the college schedules.

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee Technical Working Group

Lee responded that the District will wait until they receive campus timelines and adjust accordingly. He would like to convene a meeting in October to allow all the colleges to bring their results in to share with the Committee.

Kathy Hasson asked if the District's plan feeds into the colleges' plans, or if it is the other way around.

Salley Deaton responded that the colleges are individually accredited, not the District; therefore their plans feed up to the District. Each college serves a different community, so the goals need to be broad.

Hasson responded that at most districts it is the other way around; the broad goals result from a system built from the top. Benard responded there is a sensitivity at the colleges of the District trying to impose anything.

Hasson feels that the process was started at the top with collaboration from the colleges; a top-down approach creates broad goals and brings everyone into the process. The important thing is that the accreditation committees look for the integration of these goals; the process by which they are created is irrelevant as long as it works.

Esther Matthew asked to clarify the task; should the final master plan be aligned with strategic goals?

Lee responded that some goals and objectives should be found in all college plans; the committee originally looked at the goals of all the colleges and integrated those found more than once. Lee asked the committee when preparing their reports for October to reflect on the goals that pertain to the process over the last 18 months to 2 years, and bring in any new goals. The committee will review to determine if there is commonality and if the new goals need to be integrated into District goals.

Hasson asked if ultimately when the Board wants to see progress, will it look to the colleges and find links to the goals?

Lee responded that will be part of it. Some of the goals are departmentally specific; for example, Student Services has some goals that pertain to their own metrics. To determine those results, this committee will ask them for updates in order to update the strategic plan. It will be helpful to understand where the metric information will come from; hopefully when the District Basic Skills committee reports, the information will come from the campuses.

V. DISCUSSION ON METRICS/PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Lee continued that the committee reports tie into the need for metrics. Some goals have metrics in place; others will need to be determined.

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee Technical Working Group

Kavalier feels that the District would have common indicators that all colleges would be tracking. These might come from satisfaction surveys, retention rates, etc.

Darrell Harrison agreed how these could be lead-ins for tracking goal success.

Matthew asked if each college will create its own metrics, or if there will be common ones. Lee replied that for Student Services, there are District-wide metrics that we will ask them to bring in.

Kavalier asked if each college would identify its own indicators, or if the District would identify them for all colleges. Lee responded that we would ask appropriate District-wide committees to identify and bring in the numbers. For example, someone from the Budget committee would report on fiscal goals; for goal # 2 (Strengthen and expand support services to respond to changing student needs), Student Services Council would report, etc.

Hasson thinks there are a couple of ways to do this to make sure it contained. First, we can create a system (i.e. a performance measurement system). This provides a definite set of indicators with measures attached to them. Those measures would need to be set at both the strategic goal level and the objective level. The colleges would then provide a report on the activities that contribute to the objectives. She has some models available that could be used to create a performance measurement system the colleges can respond to.

Sam Shoostary recommended breaking down performance by department. Hasson responded this would be very difficult; the information comes from the college level, and Miramar does not have a researcher. While Miramar now has a research agenda that will address some of those issues, this system will specifically address the strategic plan.

Lee asked if Hasson could give a presentation in the fall about the system of metrics; that will provide a second layer of input (the first is the master plan on the colleges).

Harrison asked if this would lock us into the existing objectives. Hasson asked if the goals are static, while the objectives change, or are both changeable. Lee responded that both were flexible. If the committee feels the goals are broad enough to still meet our needs, they can remain while the objectives change.

Lee expressed a concern about tracking non Instructional Services or Student Services goals; will Hasson's system be able to trace budget and other goals. Hasson replied that it will be able to track multiple indicators, such as budget to actual ratios and grant allocations.

Terrie asked if a lack of funding would reduce our desire to pursue progress on some of the objectives as we are not able to pursue all of them right now.

Harrison pointed out the priorities are different for each college; just because one is focusing on a program doesn't mean the others have to.

San Diego Community College District Strategic Planning Committee Technical Working Group

Matthew suggested it could always be classified as “we’d like to, when we get the funding.” Just because something is a goal does not mean we have to pursue it.

Lee stated that is something to discuss; maybe, given the fiscal environment not all goals should be continued. This is something we might want to address at our next meeting in the Fall.

VI. COLLABORATION WITH RESEARCH COMMITTEE/DEPARTMENT

Lee agreed with Matthew, and stated that it ties in with the collaboration with the research committee and department.

Hasson informed the committee that the Research committee has regular meetings, and have discussed the idea and feel it’s something they would like to pursue.

Harrison asked for clarification if the District is setting goals, does that mean those goals are where the funding should be directed? Will there be funding if they choose to help pursue those goals?

Salley Deaton pointed out that the District receives its money based on FTES. Because the colleges have very different populations, it is hard to align which service areas to focus on.

Harrison asked about the specific overall District-level goals, specifically those involving collaboration with CTEA and SDICCA. Because the colleges do go in different directions to pursue those goals, there hasn’t always been the funding to support them.

Lee agreed that Harrison made a good point relating to funding and District goals. He believes this is a discussion to continue, and possible involve the Cabinet in if it is determined that something is a goal, but there is insufficient funding to pursue that goal.

Harrison is concerned that may cause the campuses to shift their focus to follow the money. Matthew argued that because all of the colleges contributed to these goals, it is not the District as a separate entity imposing requirements on the colleges.

Lee feels this is a very constructive conversation; this is a new process for everyone, and something for everyone to continue to help evolve. Lee gave examples of how he had used the plan to help advocate for funding, and hopes everyone will do the same.

VII. MEETINGS FOR 2009-2010

Lee thanked everyone how has served on the committee who will be leaving, and those who will continue. He hopes to see the next meeting occur in October 2009 for what he hopes will be monthly meetings.

**San Diego Community College District
Strategic Planning Committee
Technical Working Group**

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Handouts:

1. May 15, 2009 Meeting Agenda
2. Draft Minutes from the November 30, 2008 meeting
3. 2009-2012 Strategic Plan

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:55p.m.