

SMCCCD Strategic Planning Taskforce Meeting
February 11, 2008
12:00 – 2:00PM
CSM1-115

Meeting Notes

Members in attendance: Kathy Blackwood; Carla Campillo; Patty Dilko; Ulysses Guadamuz; Sue Harrison; Jing Luan; Vicki Morrow; Joan Murphy; Bart Scott; John Sewart;

Members absent: Juan Arias; Jeremy Ball; Kathy Hasson; Lauren Hernandez; Matt Kador

Review of Meeting Notes from December 3rd

Bart Scott noted that he was in attendance but that his name was not included in the members in attendance list.

Planning Status

a. Environmental Scanning update

Jing indicated that the environmental scanning is almost complete. There are a couple of other surveys being conducted including a community needs survey which is in process and in late spring an in-class high school student survey will be conducted.

Jing indicated that all data that is publishable and is available on Jing's website. Jing said that the report that Vicki had brought showing enrollment over time had been located online and been published along with other forecast data for enrollments.

Jing shared with the group a map of the state showing enrollment change.

b. Jing passed out a flowchart showing the strategic Planning Modules and the progress to date as far as completing the strategic planning process. On the flip side of that document, Jing again reviewed with the group the SMCCCD Planning Processes and Timelines showing the college planning processes as they relate to the SMCCCD Strategic plan. Patty noted that due to the accreditation outcomes it will be important to clearly define the strategic plan vs. the educational plan.

Vicki noted that the Planning Processes and Timelines document should be footnoted to indicate that as the planning processes at the colleges proceed, they will eventually come into sync with the District Strategic plan and will feed into that plan. Jing agreed and reiterated that it is a Board goal to create an integrated planning structure in order to integrate and synchronize college planning with district planning.

Jing handed out a draft of environmental scan analysis mixed with some planning assumptions in a document titled "SMCCCD Strategic Plan" —and asked the group to review it briefly. He noted that there would be time outside the meeting to review the document thoroughly. He brought the group's attention to the definitions of environmental scanning and planning assumptions on the first page. He noted that typically, the environmental scan analysis is followed by planning assumptions and that is followed by goals and strategies development.

Vicki noted that the wording that appears in the Board Goal that is printed at the top of the document should not say "District's Educational Master Plan" rather it should say "District strategic plan".

Jing noted that the information in the Strategic Plan reflects data analysis completed at the district as well as some information from college researchers. The planning assumptions are organized into 5 areas including Demographics, Education, the Economy, Policies/Public Opinion and Technology. He noted that these assumptions are in a state of flux so the document does not contain any references. Also, he noted that as he wrote these assumptions he went from a broad national view down to a local view within each category

Vicki noted that the assumptions should not include reference to the Spellings commission and their recommendation on standardized testing. However, both she and Patty agreed that something does need to be said about accountability in general.

Jing inquired among the group what their feelings about following the steps of environmental scan analysis, developing planning assumptions and later developing broad strategic directions. The group suggested skipping the step of planning assumptions .

Jing noted that the strategic planning document forms a picture. In each category, there is national, state, local and internal information. Vicki thought that this was a good structure and John Sewart and the rest of the group agreed. They suggested using subheadings to make that distinction more clear. Jing noted that sometimes there is no national data, so it makes it awkward. The group agreed that if, for instance, there was not a national section that there just wouldn't be a subheading for that section. It was noted that the use of subheadings would also help call out where data may be missing. Jing also noted that The "policies and public opinions" section generally contains input from external sources.

A brief discussion was held regarding some information related to parking from a student survey, which appears in the document on page 15. The text says that "parking is always not enough" and the group thought that it is more a matter of parking not being convenient vs. not being available at all.

Vicki asked how the planning assumptions would be processed. Jing noted that the process is behind in that the planning assumptions should have been done by Fall, 2007 and that we need to move on to the "given these are the assumptions, what do we do next?" stage. Jing would like everyone to review the assumptions, fill in any gaps and make suggestions. He would like people to makes suggestions but suggest things that are really needed so as to avoid a complex research project or literature survey.

John Sewart suggested that on page 13, the table at number 28 showing the degrees and certificates be expanded to include additional rows and columns distinguishing between degrees and certificates and percentages. He noted that low unit certificates in particular are growing very quickly. He indicated that he would send Jing the data re: certificates that he has.

The group wanted to know how the team should present any changes to Jing. He indicated that he would like a bulleted list from each task force member by February 19th. He asked that this

list contain suggestions as to where there are “holes” in the document as opposed to edits on the document itself.

3. Discussion of next steps

Jing noted that the board is expecting a District Strategic Plan in place by the end of spring and that in June the first reading of the plan by the board will take place. Between now and then, we will need to have the document vetted by District Shared, District academic senate and other groups. Jing noted that for the state chancellor’s office strategic plan, they conducted 10 statewide hearings. He noted that we need to consider how to get this kind of feedback from the District and we should have venues for community to provide input as well. Jing would like to know if this group can come up with some broad strategic assumptions that we can take to these forums around which we can begin a conversation. Jing asked that as everyone is looking at the planning assumptions for them to also be thinking about some of these major strategic directions. He noted that the state’s plan, for example contained a series of goals and “sub goals” like the following:

Goal: college awareness and access
Early awareness of college;
Goal: student readiness and preparedness;

He wondered whether the group should use a similar process.

Vicki noted that some items to be included in these broad goals could center around student success and preparedness, for instance in looking at time to degree and movement from basic skills.

At this point, Jing noted that he does not have BSI data and asked the researchers to send this information to him.

Kathy Blackwood wanted to know if these goals would have measurable outcomes. Jing noted that we will need to have a rationale for the goal and reasonable outcome and will need to understand how we will measure the outcomes. Vicki noted there is a difference between strategic direction and goals and indicated that we need strategic directions with some goals hanging off them, including the Board goals.

Jing reiterated that by the time we meet again in March we should have some strategic directions and goals that can then be taken for feedback to shared governance, academic senate feedback before we get back together in May.

Vicki noted that while looking at this, each person should look at their college master plans or whichever planning document that is in process in an effort to work on piece that integrates the college planning process into the district strategic plan.

A brief discussion ensued about the fact that integrated plans include allocation of resources. Kathy noted that the resource allocation model puts resources out to the site and that there is also a spot in the allocation model for special needs. An example of this kind of planning that would require allocation of resources is the “College Connection” project, where both the districts and colleges are involved and the goal was to enhance marketing district-wide.

4. Other

Jing asked for bulleted lists with comments on strategic planning document within a week. The document will also be sent to those who are not in attendance. He also asked the researchers to send BSI data or any other data that would be of use and again asked that the group think about strategic directions. Once Jing has the input on the planning document, he will create another draft for the next meeting. We will also be able to talk about strategic directions at that time.

A discussion was held about how best to handle the dissemination of this info to the academic senate, district shared, classified senate etc. in our limited time frame. The general consensus is that all of these groups could be approached in March, after the next taskforce meeting. The group thought that Jing should correspond directly to the presidents of these groups and should also be available to speak to them about this subject.

The group also discussed timing as to when the information should go to the public/community. The thought was that it would be good to do this in May. Ideas were discussed but no decision was reached about where these forums would be held (North county, south county ...) and who should be invited (i.e. civic, leaders, parents... presidents from the colleges)

The next meeting will be on March 10, 2008 at the District Office Board Room.