

**San Bernardino Community College District  
District-wide Strategic Planning Committee  
2009-2010**

**Minutes  
October 29, 2009**

**PRESENT**

Scott Rippy, Faculty, CHC  
John Stanskas, Faculty, SBVC  
Miriam Williams, Classified Staff, CHC  
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC  
Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Co-Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, CHC  
Dr. Glen Kuck, Executive Director, DETS, District  
Bruce Baron, Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Services, District  
Renee Brunelle, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District  
Gloria Harrison, President, CHC  
Dr. Deb Daniels, President, SBVC  
Larry Ciecalone, President, KVCR  
Dr. Matthew Isaac, Executive Director, EDCT, District  
Dr. Noelia Vela, Chancellor, District  
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

**GUESTS**

Dr. Zelma Russ, Dean

**Welcome and Introductions**

Dr. Lee welcomed everyone and self-introductions were made. Dr. Lee distributed a committee roster and asked everyone to provide names and contact numbers.

Dr. Vela thanked everyone for participating on this committee. She stated there will be a lot of work but this work will incorporate work being done on other committees. This is an opportunity to look into the future to which we are committed. She added she is looking forward to the work and outcomes of this committee.

**Purposes of a District Strategic Plan**

Dr. Lee's PowerPoint presentation served as an outline for the session.

He described several important purposes of a sound, comprehensive District Strategic Plan (DSP), which together constitute the main reason for the establishment of the District Strategic Planning Committee:

- It provides an integrated framework within which the Board, the District, and the colleges can work toward coordinated goals over the long term.
- It facilitates effective pursuit of the missions of the District and the colleges.
- It promotes efficient use of District and college resources in the long term.

Page Two

- It helps the District and colleges anticipate challenges and take advantage of opportunities.
- It guides further planning and decision-making at all levels.

Dr. Lee noted that the secondary reason for the committee's work is compliance with the Accrediting Commission's recommendation to both colleges calling for "the development of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic plan that both acknowledges input and aligns with the colleges' educational plan and serves as a guide for planning at the college level."

### **Chancellor's Charge to the Committee**

The committee's charge is to develop a District Strategic Plan that meets the following requirements:

- Supports the colleges' educational/strategic plans
- Incorporates the Board Imperatives
- Resolves the applicable recommendations from the Accrediting Commission for both colleges
- Provides for sufficient input from major constituency groups
- Balances strategic scope with measurable objectives/outcomes

### **Characteristics of Excellent Planning Processes**

The characteristics of excellent planning processes include:

- Participation
- Scope
- Integration
- Focus on Improvement
- Communication
- Information
- Measurability
- Accountability
- Schedule
- Efficiency
- Flexibility
- Frequency
- Simplicity
- Quality Products

### **Breakout Session and Reporting**

The committee was divided into three groups to look at planning- and coordination-related problems and successes. The subgroups were to look at different experiences and decide what made the experiences successful or not.

**Group A-1**

- Fundraising – classified staff (Good experience)
  - Getting together ahead of time
  - Coordination difficult because not enough staff to participate
  - Same people always support
  - Raised lots of funds
- Facilities Master Plan (Good experience)
  - Good representation – cross section
  - Committed
  - Well designed
  - Goal—clear
  - Well facilitated (observant, engaging, took initiative)
  - Active participation
  - Results
  - Recommendations (included, met)
- Collegis – 25 Years (Bad experience)
  - Poor Beginning
  - No on-going planning group
  - Roles not clear
  - Constant confusion
  - Relationships not clear
  - Responsibilities not clear
  - Poor communication every which way
  - Players changed
  - No sense of group/commitment
  - Disorganized
  - No outcomes
  - No follow through

**Group B-1**

- Facilities - Campus Involvement with District – New Buildings/Construction (Bad experience)
  - Lack of communication
  - Not inclusive
  - No clear accountability
  - No client focus
- CHC Educational Master Plan, Master Plans for Facilities at CHC & SBVC, Changing Learning Management Systems, Sungard Transition Plan (Good experiences)
  - Thoughtful
  - Inclusive
  - Buy-in
  - Documentation
  - Input valued

Page Four

- Creativity
- Timelines
- Clear vision and goals

### **Group C-1**

- Reorganization of Instruction (Good experience)
  - Took time
  - Felt heard
  - Self reflection
  - Flexible
- Accreditation Self Study (Good experience)
  - Same as above
  - Honesty – admitted failures
- HR Evaluations/District Functions (Bad experience)
  - Development of cycle (good)
  - Monitor cycle (improvement needed)
  - Coordination with institutions not engaged

### **Comments**

Dr. Lee stated the idea is that we have to follow through, and continual monitoring is necessary to be sure the promise of the plan is achieved.

Dr. Russ added that the Board needs to come together to support the colleges, and the colleges do need time to plan their needs so there is a common thread.

Dr. Lee added that integration of board and colleges and integration of planning and follow-through is necessary. The planning process will never end. The District Strategic Planning Process (DSPP) must include evaluation and revision. We do not want to have a plan in place; we want to have a “plan in action.”

### **Recommended Approach, Process and Target Dates**

Dr. Lee stated that accomplishing a sound and comprehensive DSP that incorporates all the characteristics of excellent planning processes listed above takes a substantial amount of time, often two years or more. The Commission timeline substantially reduces the amount of time we have available. A final draft needs to be completed by August 2010 to give the board time to review and approve it before the colleges submit their Follow-Up Reports to the Accrediting Commission. Dr. Lee recommended a two-phase process.

Phase 1 will be completed by August 2010 to meet the Commission’s timeline and will draw heavily on the work already completed by the colleges to create a sound, comprehensive DSP. Most of the work needs to be completed by late April 2010 so that District Assembly has the opportunity to review the draft.

Page Five

Phase 2, which should be completed by August 2011, will consist of a thorough review and, if necessary, revision of the plan to ensure that it is an exemplary strategic plan. Dr. Lee said that he typically recommends review of a new strategic plan after one year anyway, and then a three-year cycle after that.

Dr. Lee explained he is here to facilitate the process in Phase 1, but the process will be handed off fully to the District Strategic Planning Committee in Phase 2. The process will be robust, flexible and logical enough to work well within the organization. It will accomplish what the district wants to have and will meet the Commission standards. We will start reviewing the existing plans almost immediately. We will review environmental scanning information in January and February once Kevin Fleming has completed the work he kindly agreed to do.

**HOMEWORK: Review the handout sections on process and contents and bring comments and questions so that changes can be made up front if necessary.**

Dr. Lee said broad and effective participation in the process is essential. It has already occurred in the colleges' planning efforts, and continues to occur in the colleges and in this committee. Participation will also include provisions for input on the DSP drafts. Everyone on the committee is representing a constituency group. Committee members should share information with constituent groups and should receive input from co-workers and bring that input back to the committee. This plan will impact everyone, and it is important to get feedback.

A solid foundation of research and other information is also important, said Dr. Lee, though we are missing a researcher at CHC, and the SBVC researcher has a heavy work load. We will be reviewing other plans, such as the college educational/strategic plans, the Technology Plans, and the District Resource Allocation Model. The plans already reflect a substantial amount of research. We will be looking at student performance indicators as much as possible and external documents such as the California Community Colleges Strategic Plan. Questions will arise in the course of our work that may require additional research.

Ordinarily we would review and if necessary recommend revisions to the existing mission and other foundational statements as part of the process of developing a strategic plan. All those statements have been reviewed relatively recently. Dr. Lee suggested that if updated reviews are needed, it should probably be done in Phase 2, and for now we will rely on the existing statements.

In the development of strategic directions, goals, and objectives in Phase 1, stated Dr. Lee, the committee can draw on the colleges' Educational Master Plans, and elements of the Educational Master Plans from the colleges can be incorporated by reference.

All the recommendations from this committee will be forwarded to the Chancellor. There will be one or two progress reports in the spring to the District Assembly, to the Board and to the colleges so that they stay informed and are able to provide input at the appropriate time. The Strategic Plan should guide the allocation of the district resources in the same way the colleges' plans guide allocation of their resources. No strategic

plan dictates every action. Annual monitoring and evaluation of DSP implementation should take place, and might reveal the need for a comprehensive update earlier than the recommended three-year timeline.

### **Tentative Target Dates**

- April 23, 2010 – Complete draft to District Assembly
- May 4, 2010 – District Assembly meeting
- May-August, 2010 – Final edits
- August 24, 2010 - Special District Assembly meeting for presentation of the final draft
- August 25, 2010 – Final draft to Chancellor for Board packets
- September 9, 2010 – Board study session
- September 23, 2010 – Board adoption of the DSP and Board review of the 2010 Follow-Up Reports
- September 2010 – Phase 2 of District Strategic Planning begins

### **Break Out Session and Reporting**

Dr. Lee asked the three subgroups to meet again to discuss what each group thinks are the three most important challenges and issues facing the district as a whole during the next 10 years:

#### **Group A-2**

- Stability of funding
- Redefining Mission of CCC (Who are we?)
  - External pressure – legislature and California Higher Education Master Plan
  - Community pressure – respond to fast-changing trends
  - Internal pressure – who we want to be
- Increase in CCC enrollment

#### **Group B-2**

- Resource allocation – funds for quality programs, fiscal
- Student Success/Retention/Completion
- Competitive Salaries/Staffing
- Controlled Growth
  - Enrollment Management
- Facilities
- Succession Planning – all plans
- Trust & Cooperation
- Communication
- Transparency
- Technology & Data

#### **Group C-2**

- Budget Resources Development – explosive growth

Page Seven

- Changes in marketplace – Labor Demands on Education (data driven)
- Attracting and Retaining High Quality Leadership (including faculty & staff)

### **Comments**

Dr. Lee stated that when we see developments moving toward us, one question is how soon they are going to have an impact on us. It is important to determine in what cycle we need to address these developments. We have to look ahead at what we will be including in a strategic plan.

### **Recommended Contents of the Plan**

Dr. Lee suggested the DSP include the following sections:

- Preamble and other front matter
- Description of integration
- Information foundation and context
- Strategic directions
- Strategic goals and objectives
- Action plans
- Specifications for evaluation and revision
- Glossary of Terms

With respect to the glossary, he said that we want to write the DSP so that it is not full of acronyms and jargon because it should be an intelligible document that can be understood by a lay person.

**HOMEWORK: Look at the detailed version of the outline (handout) and bring comments and questions to the next meeting.**

### **Committee Operations and Logistics**

The nuts and bolts for the operation of the committee were included in the handout. The roster will be updated and distributed. Resource persons should be used as often as needed and may be invited to the meeting. Dr. Lee asked the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Presidents to advise their staffs that they may be called upon to provide some information to the committee.

The committee members need to know what their own responsibilities are, as well as those of the facilitator. Attendance and engagement is essential. Committee members need to let the convener (Dr. Lee or Dr. Vela) know if they will not be at a meeting. Committee members need to share notes with other members who request them. They should communicate frequently with constituents and colleagues, informing them of progress and soliciting their input at every stage, and bring any issues and concerns to the meetings. Nothing in the final product of this committee should be a surprise to anyone who has taken the trouble to listen to committee members. The word should be out before the draft goes out. Members need to take an institutional perspective in deliberations, considering what would be best for the District and its students as a whole.

Page Eight

Subcommittees will be working on certain issues, and members of subcommittees also have responsibilities.

It is the convener's responsibility to ensure that a written record is maintained of the meetings and posted on the Website after Dr. Lee's review. The convener and facilitator are to keep everyone on task, and make sure that everyone gets a chance to be heard; students in particular need to be encouraged to participate and speak.

Dr. Lee asked the committee to review the proposed meeting schedule and get back to him with any calendar conflicts. A conflict with several committee members exists on December 11. Dr. Vela recommended that the December 11 meeting be held at Valley College starting at 9:00 a.m. so that committee members can meet their other commitment. Dr. Lee asked the committee members to bring their calendars to the next meeting so this conflict could be resolved. Meeting locations will rotate among the colleges and the district sites. All meetings are open.

Dr. Lee strongly recommended that we make decisions using a consensus model. He expects the committee to reach consensus as sections are completed rather than wait until there is a complete draft of the document. Dr. Lee recommended that a quorum be considered established if at least half of the active membership was present, with the understanding that if a consensus action is required when a quorum is not physically present, he will poll the active membership by email to reach and document consensus.

### **Parking Lot**

The Parking Lot is a place to list ideas that are important, but not directly relevant to the discussion, so they do not get lost.

### **Breakout and Reporting**

Dr. Lee asked the three subgroups to meet and discuss ground rules for the committee.

#### **Group A-3**

- Cell Phones Silenced – No Texting
- Healthy snacks
- [All in attendance] get to eat
- Active Listening, Respectfully
- No Interruptions
- Be Receptive and Open-Minded
- Participate
- Be Interactive
- Begin and End on Time
- Do Homework Assignments

#### **Group B-3**

- Snacks – donuts, pancakes & bacon, grits (cheesy preferred), muffins, juice
- Cell Phones on Vibrate



Page Nine

- No Interruptions – wait for the person to finish
- Facilitator Recognizes Speaker
- Start and Stop on Time
- Active Participation

### **Group C-3**

- No Interrupting While Another Speaks
- Be Succinct!
- Silence Cell Phones
- Begin on Time/End on Time/No Waiting [for late arrivals]
- Breaks on time too!
- No Sidebars – be in the moment

### **HOMEWORK**

- Review Process and Contents recommendations in detail and bring questions and comments.
- Read carefully the 2009-10 Board Imperatives and Institutional Goals; current versions of the Colleges' strategic directions/initiatives and goals; and the material on Goals and Objectives.
- Dr. Lee might send additional materials for your review, so he asked members to be on the lookout.

Since several people were absent from the committee meeting, Dr. Lee suggested he spend from 10 am to 10:30 am on November 20 bringing those members up to date. The entire group would convene at 10:30 am. The college presidents will contact the Associated Students and the Classified Senates to determine who will be representing them on this committee. If the committee does not hear from Dr. Lee, the next meeting on Friday, November 20, will begin at 10 am.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Jackie F. Buus  
Recording Secretary