

**SMCCCD Strategic Planning Taskforce Meeting - NOTES**  
**Monday, February 9, 2009**  
**12:00 – 2:00pm**

<b>Members Present:</b>  Campillo, Carla; Dilko, Patty Flores-Hernandez, Mauricio; Leiva, Adolfo Luan, Jing; Scott, Bart; Johnstone, Robert; Claire, Michael E Mohr, Tom; Jones, Charles Partlan, Martin;	<b>Members Absent:</b>  Ball, Jeremy; Galatolo, Ron; Hernandez; Laurent Kapp, Nick; Murphy, Joan; Stoup, Gregory Sewart, John J.; Morrow, Victoria P.
---	--

The meeting began at 12:15 PM.

**1. Congratulatory remarks**

The group congratulated Cañada and CSM on their reaffirmation of accreditation. Jing asked the group to give a round of applause in recognition of the hard work by the colleges' faculty and staff as led by their presidents. Jing also asked the group to applaud the Board approval of the District Strategic Plan (2008-2013) and thanked everyone for their contribution.

**2. Review meeting notes from November 17, 2008**

The group reviewed the notes from the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. There were no changes to the minutes. Jing acknowledged the Board for approving the plan, Lisa Palmer and David McClain for their work in editing and formatting the document. Jing passed around a proof document.

**3. Discuss Plan Evaluation related matters**

The District Research council agreed that we need to think about both formative and summative evaluation. They asked Jing to work with this group to come up with a plan for evaluation. Jing handed out the "planning modules" section and the "summary of recommendations" section of the District Strategic Plan approved final draft. He noted that this section indicates that the evaluation is scheduled to be done annually and noted that this will be a lot of work since there are 53 recommendations in the plan. Jing asked for thoughts about what the group collectively thought about in terms of evaluation of the strategic plan.

Mike Claire suggested that the Indicators Report from Sustainable San Mateo County might be a good format for evaluation and that at CSM they are developing a set of indicators to gauge the progress of their own master plan. Tom indicated that he is especially interested in recommendation 2.1b related to outward migration. He noted that 3 of 4 students are being lost to other colleges in the area. He believes that given the impact this has on one college in particular, he thinks that this should be a District priority. Patty noted that somehow the recommendations will need to be prioritized. Jing asked

if this is the group that should be the one to set the priorities. He asked that today the group also concentrate now on how we evaluate answering the questions of What? Who? How? When?

Tom noted that when items are prioritized it may be necessary for the District to provide expertise and resources to the Colleges.

Rob indicated that there are evaluative methods, structures and processes that are already in place at the Colleges and thought should be given as to how these priorities be layered onto these processes. Tom agreed and also said that once a priority list has been developed, it would be possible for Colleges to see where the gaps are.

Jing reminded everyone that the district plan was developed reflecting the colleges' planning goals and synchronized with the college planning cycles. Patty indicated that it was clear from the outset that the College processes would drive the implementation of the various recommendations and that this idea is still in effect. Mike suggests that some sort of crosswalk between the District Plan and the college plans could be developed and Patty suggested that some sort of scorecard be developed. Jing said that it is important that the District plan reflect the College planning priorities.

Carla wondered if all of the Colleges would work on the same items. Jing said that there are some things that would be done districtwide, however many items would be coordinated at the College level. Whether something is District or College driven would depend on the nature of the recommendation. Patty noted that there really isn't a method to understand where everyone is currently on the recommendations. She said that there really needed to be one tool that measures performance on all of the recommendations. Tom agreed and said that there should be a method to be able to see how much each college has advanced on a particular recommendation. He noted again that funding is not even across the District and that some Colleges are better funded to pursue a particular priority. If a priority is a District priority, then the District should be prepared to provide expertise and funding for those that are District priorities. Charles noted there might be items which should be pursued by all colleges such as 4.1c having to do with pursuing additional funding. Adolfo noted that we need to measure how much each of the Colleges are advancing in certain areas and identify where the colleges could work together. For instance, Skyline has already done considerable work in the workforce development area and could work with other Colleges to advance that strategic goal.

Mike thought that the next step would be to identify what we will measure and identify what our baseline is and where we are trying to get to. Rob noted that from his experience the process of identifying measures for specific goals takes a long time. He thought it would be better to set priorities first, then figure out how to measure those. He thought that as far as accreditation goes, a process that would go "deep" on a few of the recommendations rather than to report on all 53 of the items in a more superficial manner, would be better.

Tom thought that another approach to get a sense of the priorities would be to select a few major themes that are overarching, for example equity access and enrollment management, and then focus on the recommendations that address those issues.

Jing asked what the committee's role is over the evaluation of the implementation of the recommendations. Patty suggested that it first be decided which of the recommendations the Colleges want this group to start evaluating. She recommended that the Presidents and Chancellors take the first cut at determining the priorities. The discussion continued along this line. It was finally decided that the

College Presidents would ask their college councils to select their top 10 priorities according to their internal planning documents. Mike, Rob, Jing and Patty will draft a clear and consistent set of instructions that can be given to the Councils in terms of identifying the priorities. The District would also review the list and select priorities. The instructions could state that the colleges would look at the list of 53 recommendations in the District Strategic Plan, and would provide the top ten recommendations the college would like to specifically focus on through June 2010. In selecting these priorities, the colleges would agree to make progress toward them - not necessarily complete them. These lists of priorities will be brought back to the next meeting to see where the College priorities overlap and differ.

As far as evaluation, Rob suggested that a few new “domains” for each of the recommendations could be developed and that a rubric for evaluation could be developed. This tool would measure progress from a particular starting point as opposed to whether or not the recommendation has been completed. The progress could be measured by a rubric and this group will provide input on what rubric looks like. Jing noted that the role of this committee would be evaluative and informative. He said that this committee would look at all of these activities together across the district to find synergies and identify issues.

### **3. District Strategic Plan distribution and implementation**

Jing asked for suggestions on how the plan should be communicated, promoted and disseminated. It was decided that there should be a link to the document on the Trustee’s webpage. Two versions of the document would be posted, a short version and a long version including the environmental scan. Also, it was decided that the College presidents would make the announcement to their Colleges in the context of their own planning processes. The group agreed that the presidents should introduce the document.

A certain number of copies of the complete document would be printed for the management team, senates, board and the like. Patty Dilko suggested that public libraries, county officials, high schools etc. be sent copies of the document without the environmental scan.

### **4. Other**

All future meetings will begin at 12:30 to give members time to get lunch.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50PM.