**SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**November 10, 2004
District Office, Room 245**

Minutes

PRESENT:

Libby Andersen	Faculty - City College
Elizabeth Armstrong	Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College
Juilianna Barnes	Dean - Miramar College
Carolyn Buck	Academic Representative – Mesa College
Robin Carvajal	Executive Director - ETi
Gail Conrad	Academic Senate President - Mesa College
Salley Deaton	Academic Representative – City College
Dave Evans	Dean – Mesa College
Pat Fernandez	Accounting Technician – Continuing Education
Bill Grimes	Manager, Institutional Research & Planning - District Office
Rich Grosch	Board of Trustees (Ex-Officio)
Dan Gutowski	Hourglass Park Coordinator – Miramar College
Julie Huang	Human Resources Technician – District Office
Hutch Hutchinson	Academic Senate President - Continuing Education
Anne Jacobs	Student Representative – City College
Sy Lyon	Dean - Continuing Education
Kathy McGinnis	Academic Senate President – City College
Pat Mosteller	Academic Senate Vice President – Continuing Education
Wheeler North	Academic Senate President - Miramar College
Ray Ramirez	Dean - Continuing Education
Monica Romero	Career Guidance and Transfer Supervisor - Mesa College

ABSENT:

Terry Burgess	President – City College
Constance Carroll	Chancellor
Pam Deegan	Vice President of Instruction – Miramar College
Mary Granderson	Business Services – City College
Otto Lee	Interim Assistant Chancellor – District Office
Mary Lee Meiners	Academic Representative – Miramar College
Desiree van Saanen	Classified Senate President – City College

CALL TO ORDER:
Meeting was called to order at 4:35 P.M.

I.   Welcome and Review of Timeline
Libby Andersen and Otto Lee felt a time period was needed to discuss a process once the institutional priorities are identified and the criteria to evaluate the pilot projects are determined. Should this group make the decision; take the presentations back to the campus and discuss what would be best; or have a specific time where all the presentations could be made.

Libby proposed that there be discussion of the process at the December 1, 2004 meeting. Presentations for the proposed pilots would be postponed to the first meeting in the spring. The group responded positively to the suggestion.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Minutes for November 3, 2004 were approved as amended (MSC Lyon/North)

It was suggested by a member of the group to come up with an inclusive name for all of the Districts components: colleges, Continuing Education and ETi. The group unanimously agreed that the word *institutions* should be used.

III. **DISCUSSION OF COMMON INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES**
Libby Andersen summarized the last meeting referencing the institutional priorities based on the master planning presentations and the list of common institutional priorities: Collaboration & Outreach, Campus-Based Research, Faculty/Staff Development, Student Success, Innovative Approaches and Facility Planning Commonalities. Homework for today was to split up into teams and each team was to pick two priorities and then come up with common criteria that could be used to rate the pilot projects that would be proposed later on.

Salley Deaton commented that as a district wide committee we should include some district wide criteria like enrollment management, effective data, instructional planning retention and persistence. In addition, the four common recommendations from the accreditation team could be included. The group was asked for comments. Julianna Barnes commented that one of the criteria to rate a project could include a district wide criteria.

Sy Lyon responded that an effort was made to include the recommendations into the criteria, but there was some difficulty on the LRC because it was seen primarily as a college issue.

Salley Deaton expressed concern over having enough time to take each of these steps back through our planning process and other constituents, and being uncomfortable with making decisions for the whole campus.

Rich Grosch indicated that his impression was that we were doing the work in small groups.

Libby Andersen commented that those of us that sat on the Plan to Plan Committee have a different level of understanding than the faculty, administrators and staff who have joined us since September. The members' comments are really important and relevant to what we are saying, but what we are trying to do here is not ready to take back to the institutional meetings. We are working together as a group to come up with a test situation that we can next apply to the pilot projects. The process that we are going to follow will be worked on during the next meeting. Next Spring, the process will be about on how to go back and communicate, get your feedback from your master planning committee and give them enough time to discuss with their department chairs, Academic Senate and Classified Senate.

Salley Deaton responded that the committee is making a decision that was previously collaborative and now some of the shared governance is disappearing. She expressed concern that City just had their meeting today and she was given some ideas as to what they would like to see.

Wheeler North updated his Academic Senate on what we are doing and how we were moving along and asked them for autonomy, because there is not going to be enough time to go back to

them during each step of the way. He added that the group is so diverse, that he would not be able to discuss the process until the committee is able to decide which of the projects we want to choose.

Sy Lyon expressed that what we were doing here was developing a process, that this exercise was to help us formulate a process, and that once the process was developed we were going to test it in a reality state. If it works as we anticipate, then from there we could develop criteria to take back to our various constituents.

Rich Grosch commented to the group that he thinks it is really important to have buy in and the only way you get buy in is when people feel like their input is really dealt with whether you agree with it or choose to use it or not. It is important to have a process in this committee where we can deal with comments from the constituents, so we as a group need to come up with a process.

Libby Andersen asked if the committee could move forward and go through the criteria and the presentations and then return to this issue and discuss the processes. We can then decide what to incorporate and what areas can be borrowed from and have the institutions help us district wide with this process.

Ray Ramirez commented that if something comes up then we need to deal with it. The Plan to Plan Committee developed what we decided to call a productive process and that should have percolated up from the constituencies. We did a thinning out process so we did not repeat priorities but synthesized the remaining in a certain way. I thought that was what this group was going to do. If that is not what we are doing them we need to go back. The process seems to be working as far as I can tell, and if not, we need to do gap analysis and develop an action plan to assign goals and to develop the foundation.

Liz Armstrong commented that Libby was right in saying that those who were a part of the Plan to Plan Committee have a different understanding, because she is still struggling to understand what it is we are trying to accomplish here even though she is diligently reading all of the materials given to her. She feels that she does not know where the discussion is going to take us. Carolyn Buck further commented that it is not clear if the projects that we are discussing are the only task of the committee. It appears that, based on her reading, the only thing the committee is really here to do is to decide which of the projects we are going do. Once we spend the money, this committee will dismantle.

Wheeler North pointed out that in the Plan to Plan process, we realized that we could produce a strategic plan and start trying to implement it. In actuality, it is a very complex system and it is really a multitude of planning efforts that will have to co-exist. The goal of this committee is to start to say can we, as a District, come up with some small planning efforts and learn from that and eventually transcend from those efforts into something that provides the on-going mechanisms to deal with different issues as they percolate up, then strategically address those. Right now we are in a learning stage of how to pick a subject and theme that is really important to all of us, from the bottom up, and strategically plan to address and measure it. We have, in fact, addressed it and demonstrated that we can effectively operate in one area. We should gradually be able to expand that into all of these complex areas, with the understanding that we will not be able to integrate all things into one formula.

Libby Andersen commented on the importance to remember that when we had our last Plan to Plan Committee, Constance had just been selected as the new Chancellor and Augie was

stepping out. Constance expanded the focus of the small group. The group decided to finish its work, present it to the Board and wait until the Chancellor decided on the next step. Both Constance and Rich strongly support the direction we are heading, so the projects will continue. We are very fortunate that funding support is available to us because it might impact our individual institutions. Seeing how it would test out, the process is important as we come up with common district wide institutional priorities based on our master plans in the future. With these criteria and possible projects that percolate up from our master plans into priorities, there will be potential support from the District and from different departments in the District. Research or enrollment management can be utilized across all the institutions.

Salley Deaton recommended that eventually we address the four district wide accreditation recommendations. The District Office is supposed to be supporting and integrating and collaborating with the sites and this is something that has to be addressed.

Libby Anderson also agreed with Salley about the accreditation being important. Official written reports will be available in January. Then the District Strategic Planning Committee can put the reports into the process for discussion.

Ray Ramirez advised the group that Stanford University uses this model in their budget model. They have adopted a five-year turn around plan which uses 2% of their general fund every year for innovative projects that come from different departments and then there is an overarching group that selects projects and the criteria. They have to be innovative; look towards the future and be true strategic issues. Their budget model handles the mechanics.

Kathy McGinnis expressed that she believed that the District was finally coming on-board with the campuses and confirming that the District Office needs a master plan to be instep with all of our sites. Then we went off on this tangent of these six similarities.

Libby Anderson responded that it was great that the group is now coming together, because we are now at the point where we are feeling out what the process is all about.

IV.   **PRESENTATIONS: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY PILOT PROJECTS**

TEAM 3
Julianna Barnes, Kathy McGinnis, Dave Evans, Monica Romero

STUDENT SUCCESS – TEAM 3 (A)
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Evidence of a need for the project
- Baseline data/research provided
- Clear goals/objectives
- Clear plan of activities to achieve goals: adequate personnel, resources, timeline
- Clear evaluation plan with performance measures and desired outcomes
- Evidence of institutional support after pilot phase

FACILITY PLANNING COMMONALITIES –TEAM 3 (B)
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Staffing formula for new buildings
- Data on square footage/functionality
- Data on student use

- Scenario with supplies/equipment staffing
- Recognize the disconnect between end users and architects
- Open lines of communication
- Identify faculty/staff member within department to be included on the project
- Identify the mechanism for repair of facilities including number of maintenance staff, building age, health and safety

Question(s) and Comment(s):

If you had four or five proposals for the buildings; how would you know which proposal was better than the other.

Each campus has its own unique needs. For example, Miramar has a new Gymnasium going up which needs a reception desk and staffing; however, there are zero classified staffing moneys allocated for this. Mesa had a problem with the library when it went up and Miramar is still having a problem with their library. Dave Evans proposed that a percentage formula be identified. If you have a building 5,200 square feet, a certain percentage of staffing should be allocated to run that building.

Is there a distinction between new and replacement buildings?
The formula for a new building was discussed. More money should be allotted for a new building since additional personnel would be needed to staff a brand new 100,000 square foot learning resource center versus an existing 5,000 square feet one.

Rich Grosch responded that a formula like this could be supported by the Board.

TEAM 5
Salley Deaton, Sy Lyon, Mary Lee Meiners, Julie Huang, Pat Mosteller

FACULTY/STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Impact on each institution
- Improve Student Learning Outcomes
- Facilitate and enhance collaboration between institutions
- Impact enrollment growth, retention and persistence
- Enhance awareness of staff diversity

Question(s) and Comment(s):

Does impact on enrollment growth also include things like impact on retention?
Sy Lyon responded in the affirmative. In Continuing Education enrollment is not a big issue, it's sitting "in the seat" that is the real issue; unlike the colleges we do not get paid just for enrollment.

TEAM 2
Gail Conrad, Robin Carvajal, Pam Deegan, Pat Fernandez

FACULTY/STAFF DEVELOPMENT - TEAM 2 (A)
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Opportunity to benefit the district
- Measurable outcome/deadline
- Innovative/replicate somewhere else in the district

- Crossover all constituencies
- Pertinent to subject disciplines/job classification
- Adequate reassigned time
- Consistent procedures with established district staff development procedures
- Based on current needs of program
- "Pride of Ownership"

COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH - TEAM 2 (B)
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Supports institution's priorities for growth
- Data driven justification
- Internal institution support
- Focus existing resources for impact
- Identify program development in state priority areas that support economic and community development
- Measurable outcomes
- Engages all institutions
- Offers employee development
- Applied to varied types of employers
- Ensures district established procedures are consistent
- Provides foundation for "Pride of Ownership"

TEAM 4
Terry Burgess, Ray Ramirez, Mary Granderson, Carolyn Buck, Wheeler North

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Relevant/Realistic (based on local, state initiative)
- Time dimensional (cost bound)

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Assess institutional need
- Develop resource strategies
- Identify and prioritize needs
- Provide for continuous improvement
- Include all stakeholders
- Communicate

STUDENT SUCCESS
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Specific
- Measurable
- Achievable
- Relevant/Realistic (based on local, state initiative)
- Time Dimensional (cost bound)

TEAM 1
Elizabeth Armstrong, Dan Gutowski, Hutch Hutchinson, Bill Grimes, Desiree van Saanen

COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Assessment of economic community
- Responsive to economic community
- Development of curriculum, programs, staffing
- Improve marketing to potential students as well as the economic community
- Improve District visibility to civic, business and industry and our community

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Assessment of economic community
- Responsive to economic community
- Development of Curriculum, programs, staffing
- Marketing to potential students as well as the economic community
- District visibility to civic, business and industry and our community

STUDENT SUCCESS
Evaluation criteria for proposed pilot project should include:
- Assessment of Economic Community
- Responsiveness to Economic Community
- Development of Curriculum, Programs, Staffing
- Marketing to Potential Students as well as the Economic Community
- District Visibility to Civic, Business and Industry and our Community

Question(s) and Comment(s):

Robin Carvajal thanked Team 1 for going outside of the box. From her experience, she indicated that Community Colleges are not a significant player at the table. This is the time for us to become a world-class significant player in the San Diego economy.

Salley Deaton added that she does not think there is enough money coming from the State. We need to get better at utilizing other resources to fund our program. People have things to offer, but nobody has any money. Instead of always asking for funds,, we need to say this is the expertise we need to solve your problem and you have this expertise to solve our problem; let's get together and see if we can do this. We have to embrace the business community and the social community to help us meet our educational goals.

Rich Grosch concurred because it is critically important that when a business comes and says we have this need that we can respond satisfactorily to train their people.

Hutch Hutchinson added that in his experience of working with industry, many companies have several different niches in a market. In essence we are no different; the San Diego Community College District is exactly the same as a business. We have a variety of levels that we cannot meet such as the needs of the business civic community client. The question is how effectively we do that.

Bill Grimes commented that Hutch's ideas were really interesting because they twist around our thinking process and say we have these clients out there: business and industry. I think

each institution has its head down looking forward to its own path and does not see the opportunities that that kind of perspective really pulls together.

Robin Carvajal commented that she considers the Strategic Planning effort a huge tremendous success; and that she hopes the beginning of this effort will begin to grow in our District, because there is so much duplication of effort.

Salley Deaton commented that we talk about industry, but we have also forgotten about our high schools. They have a whole setup of rules and regulations that make it very hard to work them. If we do not somehow bring them into becoming economic resources and not social parasites to our community, we are going to have huge problems.

Liz Armstrong stated that we need to keep in mind that San Diego is a leading area for intellectual properties and an area for the work that we have done in biotechnology. Having UCSD is a major entry for growth in this area. We certainly cannot train the research scientist, but we can get students into those programs; we can train the lab technicians at different levels, human resources people and those people who are going into the health industry, so there is a lot in that area we can do.

Dan Gutowski added that there are several levels where we can do that, from certification to customized training.

Rich Grosch asked if there was someone or a department officially designated that you would go to in reference to biotechnology programs.
The consensus among the group is the District does not have anyone nor a department that is responsible for staying updated in that area; however, when the new Economic Development and Workforce Dean comes on board, that person would be our voice out in the community to keep our District informed about the various projects of this nature.

Ray Ramirez added that in the past, there were twelve vocational coordinators who were assigned to the District Office whose assignments were to coordinate with business and industry for the purpose of keeping our occupational courses current and relevant.

V. DETERMINATION COMMON CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Libby Andersen asked for a consensus from the group. Initially during this meeting our goal was to write down priorities and identify criteria. We have identified the following priorities: three (3) for Collaboration Outreach, one (1) for Campus-Based Research, two (2) for Faculty/ Staff Development, two (2) for Student Success, one (1) for Innovative Approaches and one (1) for Facilities Planning Commonalities. There were a couple out-of-the box approaches. Should we create criteria, or pick one set of criteria, or pull together the criteria that are here and have Otto and Libby pull out the commonalities?

Ray Ramirez commented that an interim period is needed for the group to analyze and prioritize everything that we have identified. Kathy McGinnis suggested this information be put in an electronic document as before, so committee members can start talking about the topics on campus.

Rich Grosch reminded the group to return to the issues that Salley had brought concerning accreditation and communicate with the institutions. Salley Deaton supported three things we can immediately do: a marketing project and a volunteer project to research how we can better

utilize the resources that we have, and something to address the accreditation issue (e.g. the diversity issue).

Sy Lyon expressed that his recollection was not to displace campus-based or institutional-based operations, but to address college issues which Rich pointed out are really important to the Board and to the District. Procedures are in place to address college issues like accreditation which are uniquely college issues. The thinking out-of-the box proposal is commendable, but this committee's charge was to come up with criteria. Items like this could be discussed if they meet the criteria that this group wants to implement. While it is an excellent document, our primary concern should be developing criteria that allows us to select those sorts of things.

VI.   SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITES THAT USE COMMON CRITERIA (Postponed)

VII.   HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT (NEXT STEP: HOW TO REVIEW PROPOSED PILOT PROJECTS):
Assignment: Process all the information from this meeting, go back and discuss it with your colleagues and bring feedback what you think are the Common 5-7 Criteria to use in evaluating a pilot project.

VIII.   ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

The next Strategic Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, <u>December 1, 2004,</u> from <u>4:30 p.m.</u> - 6:30 p.m. at the District Office in Room 245.

Recording Secretary, Chantaya Robinson - District Office
Otto Lee, Interim Assistant Chancellor 388-6965