

SMCCCD Strategic Planning Committee Meeting
Regular Meeting
Monday, October 12, 2009
12:30-2:00PM
District Office Board Room

Meeting Minutes

In attendance –Rakefet Avramovitz; Adolfo Leiva; Ray Hernandez; Jing Luan; Kathy Blackwood; Mike Claire; Vicki Morrow; Diana Bennett; Annette Perot; Sue Harrison; Martin Partlin; Denisse Gonzalez

1) Introduction of new members

The meeting started at 12:40PM. Jing conducted a round of introductions. As president of the classified senate at Skyline, Rakefet Avramovitz will replace Adolfo Leiva on the committee. Denisse Gonzalez is the new student representative.

2) Review Meeting Notes from September 14, 2009 (All)

Vicki moved and Kathy Blackwood seconded the approval of the minutes from the September 14th meeting. Rakefet, Denisse and Mike abstained. All other attendees voted “aye” and the minutes were accepted.

3) Planning Priorities and Role of the Committee (All)

Jing discussed the role of the committee. He indicated that the main focus of the group will be to continue evaluating the strategic planning priorities identified by the colleges. The group will also review proposals with districtwide impact which come out of the budget planning processes at the colleges. The fourth Monday of the month has been calendared for this purpose. The meetings will be cancelled is there is nothing to consider.

Jing distributed a list of all the planning priorities with items marked that indicate the 14 items that the committee has indicated would be the planning priorities for the year. Jing asked the group to review the items and make a final decision that these items would be the ones that would be the focus for the group for 2009-2010. Two items were discussed in this context:

Item 2.4a Review the current articulation agreements with 4-year institutions to identify opportunities for increasing the number of transfer students. Vicki noted that the VPs at Skyline reported that it is their understanding that all of the courses that need to be articulated are already articulated and that there is a process through the curriculum committees that makes sure any new coursework is articulated if necessary. She indicated

that she would check with Lori Adrian to make sure this is correct across all three Colleges. Jing noted that there had been some question as to whether articulation agreements could be implemented at the District level. He noted that this is a College undertaking and the District does not negotiate articulation agreements.

2.4c Identify strategies for understanding and addressing the decreasing trend in transfers to CSUs. Vicki indicated that John Sewart, in his role on the DRC, had been asked to study this issue to see if the trend had anything to do with the admissions policies at CSUs. The work has been done and the conclusion was that the CSU admissions policies were not the cause of the trend.

4) Continued discussion on plan evaluation and use of [Sequencing Action Matrix](#) (All)

Jing distributed the sequencing action matrix which will be renamed to: *Strategic Plan Evaluation Sequencing Matrix*. The matrix will be updated continuously by the District Strategic Planning Committee. The document will be made available to the college constituencies by the end of spring semester, 2009-2010, along with the documentation that will be generated for the various planning items, as a report of the work of this committee.

Jing has reviewed this document with the Vice Presidents and made a few changes based on their input. He indicated that the committee process for reviewing each of the 2009-2010 planning priorities on the matrix would be to:

1. Talk about the item
2. Assign a responsibility
3. Add comments
4. Develop a summary of the progress at end of Spring, 2010

A brief discussion ensued about the format and structure of the matrix. It was decided that the last column of the matrix should be titled "Evaluation Method and Documentation" and will include a description of the method that will be used to indicate how the planning item will be evaluated and what the output from that evaluation will be (ie a report, a survey, etc.)

Jing also noted that he is planning to put the documentation related to this committee on TracDat which is a tool that will allow committee members to access and update information, create reports and to add supporting documents.

The group then walked through and commented on the planning agenda items contained in the matrix.

(1) 1.2b *Develop a holistic diversity framework that supports the access and success of diverse student populations, promotes institutional vitality and viability, and serves all students equitably.*

Committee Discussion:

Status: Skyline will provide a draft approach to evaluating this item sometime before the next meeting of this committee.

Responsibilities Presidents

Evaluation Method/Documentation: (to be determined in the draft to be provided)

(2) 2.2a *Identify gaps in student educational achievement. Develop holistic approaches designed to retain students, including approaches in teaching, intervention, learning styles, financial aid and counseling.*

Committee Discussion: This planning priority is tied to the DRC research agenda item regarding student equity. Vicki asked that DRC research be brought to the next meeting so that this group can review the work that's being built through the local planning committees.

Status:

Responsibilities: DRC

Evaluation Method/Documentation:

(3) 2.3a *Streamline processes and practices to allow students seamless access to educational opportunities across the District.*

Committee Discussion: This item has to do with service collaboration, consolidation etc.

Mike indicated that some of this work is underway right now as part of the colleges' processes in response to the budget situation. Some of these decisions may have districtwide implications and will be brought to this committee for review. Process and practices coming about because of the budget planning can be incorporated into this evaluation. The VPs will ultimately be responsible for this information

There are also other back office processes that are being reviewed and revamped that are not part of the budget planning but would be appropriate for inclusion in the evaluation of this item. For instance, the financial aid committee is looking at the possibility of outsourcing the printing of the financial aid checks. Other work like prerequisite alignment, graduation requirement alignment and course equivalency matrix are being examined by the district curriculum committee. The District Curriculum committee would be responsible for reporting this information

Status:

Responsibilities: VP's, District Curriculum Committee, Financial Aid and other committees working on back office processes.

Evaluation Method and Documentation:

(4) 2.4a *Review the current articulation agreements with 4-year institutions to identify opportunities for increasing the number of transfer students.*

Committee Discussion: As noted earlier in the meeting, articulation agreements are in place and a system is also in place to develop new articulation agreements as necessary.

Status: Awaiting Documentation

Responsibilities: VPs

Evaluation Method and Documentation: Report from VPs on the articulation agreements that are in place and an explanation of the existing process of creating new articulation agreements.

(5) 2.4c *Identify strategies for understanding and addressing the decreasing trend in transfers to CSUs.*

Committee Discussion: As was discussed earlier in the meeting, research about CSU admission policies has been completed by John Sewart as part of the DRC.

Status: Vicki will ask John to write a report on his research about this item and bring that report to this committee. The committee can then review the report to see if it satisfies this item.

Responsibilities: DRC (John Sewart for data)

Evaluation Method and Documentation:

(6) 3.1b *Identify emerging workforce development opportunities for each of the Colleges and respond to changing job training needs through the Colleges Career and Technical Education programs and services.*

Committee Discussion: Referring to the comments in the “Status” column of the matrix for this item (item 6) the group decided that previous committee requests for evaluation and documentation requests regarding this subject were too narrow because they focused so much on grants which are only a small part of the workforce development issue. The committee decided that Jing should ask the VPs to create a reporting mechanism for their activities regarding workforce program development and collaborations with the WIB, which can be incorporated in the district planning cycle. The report would not focus on grants exclusively but on the overall needs, opportunities and activities of the program and the efforts in collaboration and coordination between the colleges.

Status: Jing will ask VPs to create a reporting mechanism for their activities regarding workforce program development.

Responsibilities: Jing/VPs

Evaluation Method and Documentation

(7) 4.1a *Continue and expand initiatives and services that optimize enrollment.*

Committee Discussion: Martin asked how the FTES cap is allocated and coordinated among the three colleges and whether there should be a districtwide approach to deciding on these levels. Kathy noted that from the current budget perspective the colleges have been asked to cut enrollments by a common percentage lower than where we were last year. However, when there is the opportunity for growth, the goals are set by the cabinet at each college. She

reiterated that in the near term there will be shrinkage at a common percentage. When the District eventually gets to basic aid, assuming the state doesn't raid property taxes, we will need to decide what is the right size for each college. Martin suggests that, as part of this planning item, there be a districtwide discussion about what "optimize" means. Jing also noted that opportunities in international education and distance education strategies should be identified and collected and included in the evaluation of this item.

Status:

Responsibilities: Deans, engaging VPs as necessary

Evaluation Method and Documentation

(8) 4.1c *Pursue additional state, federal, philanthropic, and corporate funding*

Committee Discussion:

Status: Assigned to CBOs, via Kathy Blackwood, whose reports will help the committee determine an appropriate evaluation method. Jing suggested the development of a matrix.

Responsibilities: CBOs and Foundation

Evaluation Method and Documentation

(9) 4.2d *Develop staffing plans that recognize existing staffing resources in all employee categories and project future resource needs.*

Committee Discussion: Mike said that they have restructured their committees and have an HR committee that is working on these issues. He said that CSM could come up with a draft approach to an evaluation and documentation plan for this item.

Referring to the "Status" column for this item, Vicki asked for clarification on the wording. The suggestion was to change the "Status" wording to reflect that information about the managed hiring/service reduction/consolidation activity that is currently underway at the colleges as a result of the budget situation will be made available to the committee by December 09 so that the processes involved in the activity can be documented and included in the evaluation and reporting of this planning item.

(10) 4.3b *Continue to leverage capital improvement with state and local*

resources. **Committee Discussion:** Vicki asked that the wording on the matrix be changed to match the wording in the strategic plan.

Status: Kathy Blackwood will present a final report in spring of 2010.

Responsibilities: Kathy Blackwood

Evaluation Method and Documentation: Report

(11) 4.5a *Strengthen professional and academic development opportunities for faculty and staff.* 4.5b *Strengthen faculty and staff development that supports activities to meet accreditation standards.*

Committee Discussion: Information about funding for professional development can be obtained from staff at each college. Each college also has a professional Development Committee who can address the degree of alignment of activities funded with institutional goals and priorities. Vicki noted that there is a survey planned in 2011 via the DRC which will include questions about this item. Jing also indicated that we could include the Structured Training for Online Teaching (STOT) opportunities in the reporting/evaluation of this item.

Status:

Responsibilities:

DRC–Survey;

Professional Development Chairs: Denise Erikson at Cañada, Lyle Gomes and Sandra Comerford at CSM and Nina Floro (PEDAC) at Skyline.

Staff who track funding data: Vickie Nunes at Cañada, Valerie Anderson at CSM, Teresa Tentos at Skyline and Rachelle Minong at the District Office

Evaluation Method and Documentation:

(12) 5.1a *Establish policies and planning activities that are coherent, transparent and available to all stakeholders.*

Committee Discussion: Martin indicated that the reason this item came to be on this list is because accreditation requires this transparency. Committee members noted that each college has planning policies and activities and that the researchers at the colleges can report on this information.

Status

Responsibilities: District Researchers

Evaluation Method and Documentation: Report on what planning process is and where the documentation is on the web.

(13) 5.1c *Provide extensive, integrated and coordinated research and planning efforts and resource allocation framework to support the improvement of teaching and learning.*

Committee Discussion:

Status: To be included in DRC survey

Responsibilities: DRC

Evaluation Method and Documentation

(14) 5.2a *Expand and strengthen partnerships with high schools, 4-year institutions, community agencies and business and industry*

Committee Discussion: The discussion centered around how this item would be evaluated and documented. Martin suggested that examples of successful partnerships as well as unsuccessful attempts at partnerships could be cited. It

was decided that the presidents would take the lead and establish how this should be handled.

Status:

Responsibilities: Presidents

Evaluation Method and Documentation

5) Recap of District Shared Governance Council question on budget proposal review role of committee (Luan, Dilko)

Jing noted that he and Patty also chair the District Shared Governance Committee and that District Shared committee members had asked a question regarding the District Strategic Planning Committee's roll in the review of budget proposals. Jing told the District Shared members that the Strategic Taskforce members will be reviewing and discussing only budget proposals that have districtwide impact. He also assured the Shared Governance committee that the proposals sent to the Strategic Planning committee for review would have been thoroughly discussed and vetted through the individual college committees before being reviewed and discussed by the Strategic Planning Committee. Martin said that one concern is that if there are programs that are being discontinued or being combined with a program at another college that there would be districtwide implications about such a decision. He wondered how and if those districtwide conversations were taking place. Jing reiterated that any of those kinds of proposals would have already gone through their college vetting, processes and procedures and that this committee would simply review and discuss these types of proposals. Vicki clarified that the three VPIs are talking regularly among themselves about these various proposals that are being generated from all the different college venues and are discussing the implications and "ripples" that the proposals may have across the colleges. If there are areas of disagreement, then these would go to the College Cabinets. Vicki also noted that the PIV process is a senate process and that these types of issues would come through the senate process. Ray Hernandez agreed and explained that confirmed that the academic senate is meeting with VPs and Deans at Skyline regularly and that issues such as these would come through the Academic Senate. Diana Bennett said that some items such as costs of running a program (eg software licenses, computer hardware and the like) might not be an academic senate concern. Martin noted that there is still a concern as to how to handle a situation where a decision is made that appears not to have been totally transparent. The group agreed that the intent is that the college processes through which these proposals are vetted are transparent at all levels and that by the time the proposals make their way to this committee they will simply be reviewed and discussed. One of the responsibilities of this committee would be to make sure that the proposals that are brought to it for its review have been made in a totally transparent manner. Jing also said that the District Shared Governance Committee asked to be updated on the budget proposal review discussions that take place within this committee.

6) Other

The meeting adjourned at 2:10PM