SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

December 1, 2004
District Office, Room 245

Minutes

PRESENT:

Elizabeth Armstrong	Vice President, Instruction – Miramar College
Carolyn Buck	Academic Representative – Mesa College
Terry Burgess	President – City College
Robin Carvajal	Executive Director - ETi
Gail Conrad	Academic Senate President - Mesa College
Pam Deegan	Vice President of Instruction – Miramar College
Salley Deaton	Academic Representative – City College
Dave Evans	Dean – Mesa College
Pat Fernandez	Accounting Technician – Continuing Education
Rich Grosch	Board of Trustees (Ex-Officio)
Bill Grimes	Manager, Institutional Research & Planning - District Office
Dan Gutowski	Hourglass Park Coordinator – Miramar College
Julie Huang	Human Resources Technician – District Office
Hutch Hutchinson	Academic Senate President - Continuing Education
Otto Lee	Interim Assistant Chancellor – District Office
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:

Libby Andersen	Faculty - City College
Constance Carroll	Chancellor
Mary Granderson	Business Services – City College
Mary Lee Meiners	Academic Representative – Miramar College (?)
Desiree van Saanen	Classified Senate President –City College (?)

CALL TO ORDER:
Meeting was called to order at 4:32 P.M.

I. **Welcome and Review of Timeline**

   Otto Lee announced that the Chancellor and Cabinet were pleased with Strategic Planning Committee progress when he presented the districtwide common components in the master planning, the institutional priorities to be focused on and the proposed criteria for funding upcoming pilot projects which were identified by this committee's.

Our group task this fall was to develop a framework of understanding what the commonalities and differences are districtwide in addition to addressing some high priorities and funding some pilot projects. This spring we will tackle more of the system or critical processes oriented projects such as budgeting allocation work, looking at how we do IT planning, funding the short-term pilot projects and addressing the "parking lot" items. We will try to capture great ideas from the faculty and staff which did not fit in program review, but would improve student success, outreach efforts or campus-based research, because they were not a VTEA project or an IER weld activity. Additionally, our accomplishments shuld be highlighted to encourage that sustained funding and additional funding for the Strategic Planning Process be established.

Liz Armstrong commented that she sees strategic planning as both internally and externally oriented. The external piece is where I am having some difficulty in understanding I am not sure how effective the pilot projects are going to be. I think we have done a good job of looking at our external process in understanding what is before us in terms of or presentations. Without really coming to grips with the external environment we need to look at the three major external factors that are going to drive the success of this District, which are the K-12 System, Demographics and the University System. I would suggest that we start looking at these areas the strategic planning is not going to make a difference.

Otto Lee responded that is external scanning has been identified all along as a critical component of the strategic planning process and it will be specifically addressed this spring with the hiring of a Dean of Economic and Workforce Development in my organization. I would propose that that person in working with Bill Grimes in the research area as well as representatives from each of the institutions. They will be charged as the "face" for the District in pulling external issues together.

Liz Armstrong felt that the strategic planning for all those components should be left to this group and not with only one person being responsible. Specific information should be requested and consultants brought in to help move the District in the appropriate direction.

Otto Lee responded that he how we tackle the different possible solutions will be important to do in the spring as we formalize more of the District Strategic Planning Process.

Monica Romero asked where the funds for the pilot projects came from and why such a short timeline to do the pilot projects?
Otto Lee responded that there was a one-time funding resource which the Chancellor committed to financially support some strategic planning initiatives and that the leaders of these pilot projects would be given enough time to complete the projects.

Salley Deaton commented that City College is in the process of getting ready to do the environmental scan but doesn't want to proceed if someone else or the District is going to do it. John Schlegel has indicated the money is a part of the reserves balance which can be used this or next year. This scan is a lot of work and the information should be shared districtwide. ?? (City's scan good for Mesa?) Going back to the Mesa Environmental Scans; we have a mission and criteria, however I have a concern that our mission is Title 5. Salley would like to have a mission statement projecting what we should look like in twenty years. She was concerned that we are still in the "present" and some of our team should be out toward the future (e.g. 20 years).

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Minutes for November 10, 2004 were moved for approval as amended (MSC Anne Jacob/Salley Deaton)

III. **ESTABLISH 2-3 INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITES FOR PILOT PROJECTS (handout)**
Rich Groch presented a short 30-seconded presentation to the group.

Otto Lee indicated it was time to wrap up this planning effort, and move ahead to begin finding away to get some of the pilot projects started which fits in with our priorities. The group established six institutional priorities that we agreed on. I would like to have some discussion as to what I am invisioning. Representatives were asked to solicit ideas from their campuses. and bring them back to the committee so we can have a discussion on which ones make sense for us to fund.

Due to December finals and winter recess, Gail Conrad suggested that the group should work a little slower with the timeline in order to give this task the amount of time necessary to do the job well.

Wheeler North asked if the committee was planning to fund all of the institutional priorities or only fund one to two?
Otto Lee responded that since it is a new process and we have a very pressed schedule his recommendation was that we try to identify one to two priorities, and put all the others in the parking lots. In September we will have a full shared governance process to help identify ideas to address those priorities and everyone will have an opportunity to summit ideas.

Kathy McGinnis commented that City College has already started dialogue; the chairs have been made aware and these priorities would be shared with their Senate on Monday so discussion could begin in February.

Since faculty assignments are being created right now, Liz Armstrong was concerned that projects need to be done between March 30-June 15 and faculty working on projects would be in an overload status and the quality of the projects could be jeopardized. Therefore, it makes more sense to plan for a summer project or a fixed fall project.

Otto Lee responded that there might not be that many projects suggested and we may not use the whole $100,000, but there have been some ideas that have been percolating by champions who are willing to commit that time.

Salley Deaton commented that she would prefer we did not limit ourselves to just the three institutional priorities that are listed in bold because she thinks all six are valid.

Teri Burgess suggested that the committee leave it open ended as some people may have a 60-day, 90-day, 120-day or 1-year project. Since the money is in a reserve account, it will carry over into the next fiscal year so proposals could come back a little later.

Bill Grimes added that he feels the committee should really look at the projects strategically-- what are the major things we want to accomplish from the projects. He thought the major requirement was "learning" and that it should involve all the institutions with enough cross over areas within the institutions to take out the competitive element and make it a participating element which would open up new communication channels across the District.

Salley Deaton felt that if we want to do projects that involve all the institutions, this committee would have to decide what areas we want to work on and say this is how we all are going to solve this problem. If we take it back to the institutions and ask for a project it would be more campus based, and then we are swinging between the District Planning Committee and our Campus Planning Committee; in effect, we are mixing apples and oranges.

Otto Lee said when we get some ideas from the campuses, it might turn out that each of the campus ideas are very similar. We want to respect and work with the planning process on the campuses because that is where many of the ideas are generated.

There was discussion about the process of deciding whether the committee should come up with the recommendations for a pilot project and then take the information back to the institutions for additional ideas and input. The consensus from the committee was that this committee should come up with the ideas and then present the information to the individual institutions. The group also came to the consensus that Environmental Scans should be the first project to start with since it would address the collective committee concern that we embark on the project, but also take the information back to the institutions for their input staying within the March timeframe.

IV.   **ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR FUNDING INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY PIOLT PROJECTS**

EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENTAL SCANS – (Drivers and Imports)
- **Demographics**
- **K-12, University**
- **Markets & Competitors**
- **Existing Data**
- **Internal Capability to Meet the Need**
- **Economic Trends (Global/Outsourcing)**
- **Job Trends**
- **Funding/Government/Legislative**
- **Agencies (San Diego Workforce, other Partnerships)**
- **K-6 pipeline Research**
- **Social Trends (e.g. Immigration)**
- **Futurists**
- **Political**
- **Benefactors/Advocates Development**

EXTERNAL ENVIRONENTAL SCANS – (Process)
- **How is it done (Sources)**
- **Workshops**
- **Ongoing/Sustainability**
- **Frequency (which part)**
- **Utilization (who, how)**
- **Synchronization with our process**

V. **A PLAN FOR COMMUNICATING TO INSTITUTIONS AND SOLICITATION OF IDEAS FOR A ONE-PAGE PROPOSAL FORMAT**

Otto Lee reviewed the hand out that listed the proposed common criteria for evaluating pilot proposals. He then asked the committee for other ideas that will help the group to communicate and encourage involvement from the institutions.

Salley Deaton commented that she thought that the committee decided not to do the little projects, but to do the environmental scan. If we are going to do both the environmental scan and the pilot projects, the communication process is different since the environmental scan is will affect all the departments/institutions and will not need the same type trickle down communication like campus based projects.

Otto Lee said he understood that the committee did not want to solicit information over the holiday break and wanted to stretch out the timeline a little bit so we are not trying to in a half to do some of the pilot projects. We agreed that everyone would go back to their campus committees in the February and March. If there are good projects they would not necessarily have to be done between March and June, it could be done over the summer or whenever was appropriate.

Pat Mosteller asked if the environmental scan would change the decision of the pilot projects and if the environmental scan should be done first?
Wheeler North responded no, not necessarily, he thinks there is nothing wrong with soliciting ideas because the environmental scan is just a process of being able to take a picture by project ideas. In terms of Campus Based Research and Student Success, they probably are not going to change too much given the outcome of the specifics of the environmental scan. The ideas themselves may need to be adjusted slightly.

However, Pat Mosteller commented that if we come up with a project for industry and community and then the environmental scan tells us that industry is going in a different direction than we had planned, then that will necessitate a change in the plan.

Otto Lee responded that Pat made a good point, because some campuses would not support or propose an Industry Outreach at this point of the environmental scan. Otto will send an email out to define each of the proposed common criteria.

Pat Mosteller asked if the projects can be home based for our individual institution, or districtwide so everyone in the District would benefit from?
Otto Lee respondedthat since we are adopting the criteria, something in a proposal that was strictly campus based would not be as strong as one that would facilitate working with some of the other campuses.

OTHER IDEAS TO COMMUNICATE TO THE INSTITUTIONS
- Time dimensional and cost bound
- Under the common criteria, change the word *impact* to *increase*
- Evidence of needing to fund a project
- One-page online template to fill out
- One-page form that clearly states what we will and will not do and include items such as the budget, what kinds of things are allowable-- if we can replace salary, pay hourly, classified support, supplies, equipment, travel, etc.

- 2-4 questions as a guidance for the kinds of projects to write about
- Introduction and summary of the committees purpose for clarity
- 2-page form, the first page to have the mission, priorities and criteria with explanations and the second page to have information for them to fill out.
- Information needs to be very clear when be presented to the institutions
- A process of which one is going to have a benefit to all the institutions
- Proposal to benefit a minimum of two institutions

VI.   DEADLINES AND MEETING DATES FOR JANUARY – JUNE 2005

The Committee will resume in February and begin to meet the first and third Wednesday of each month until May 2005 from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

THE NEXT MEETING DATES ARE AS FOLLOWS:
- February 2, 2005
- February 16, 2005
- March 2, 2005
- March 16, 2005
- April 6, 2005
- April 20, 2005
- May 4, 2005
- May 18, 2005

VII.   ADJOURNMENT
Meeting adjourned at 6:31 P.M.

The next Strategic Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 2, 2004 from 4:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m. at the District Office in Room 245.

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