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

Minutes
February 26, 2010

PRESENT

Bruce Baron, Acting Chancellor
Damaris Castillo-Torres, Student, SBVC
Dr. Deb Daniels, President, SBVC
Jackie Ford-Wingler, Classified Staff, CHC
Dr. Marshall Gartenlaub, EDCT (representing Dr. Matthew Isaac)
Laura Gowen, Classified Senate, SBVC
Gloria Harrison, President, CHC
Kaylee Hrisoulas, Student, CHC
Dr. Glen Kuck, Executive Director, DETS, District
Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, CHC
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC
Dr. John Stanskas, CHC Faculty
DyAnn Walter, Classified Staff, District Office
Keith Wurtz, Researcher, CHC
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

I. Welcome and Introductions

Matthew welcomed everyone.

II. Approval of Minutes – February 5, 2010

The February 5, 2010 minutes were approved by consensus.

III. Review and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

A. Edited Transcript of Posted Comments, February 5, 2010 (document 8A)

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on *document 8A*. There were no questions.

B. Working Set of District Strategic Directions and Goals, February 5, 2010 (document 8B)

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions regarding *document 8B*. There were no questions.

C. Consolidated Strategic Issues Subcommittee Reports (document 8E)

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions regarding *document 8E.* There were no questions.

IV. Discussion and Possible Revision of *Suggested Major Planning Assumptions (Document 8F)*

The suggested major planning assumptions, as stated in the introductory paragraph of *document 8F*, are based on an analysis of the Strategic Issues Subcommittees' reports, the performance and impact indicators, the Center of Excellence Environmental Scan reports, and the Committee's discussions of all these items (and more) as set forth in the *Edited Transcripts of Posted Comments* and the *Minutes.* Matthew said he suggested these planning assumptions because they seemed most relevant to the District Strategic Plan.

Matthew asked if there were any comments or suggested changes in the *Suggested Major Planning Assumptions (Document 8F).* Troy suggested doing an assumption on student learning. There were no objections. Matthew will draft something on student learning as a separate assumption and will bring it back next time. Marshall said the shift in demographics, which would have an impact on how we look at our classes, is not included. Keith wondered if the assumption would be that the community we serve is in constant change and that we need to pay attention to that. Matthew will try to draft an assumption on the changing community. He noted that assumptions are typically external factors, and do not state what we are going to do.

The DSPC achieved consensus on the 12 listed assumptions. Matthew will bring drafts of the additions discussed back to the committee.

V. Breakout, Report and Action: Discussion and Possible Revision of *Working Set*

Matthew went through his suggestions in *document 8D.* When the committee concluded its earlier discussions, there were certain options that needed to be revisited. Matthew made some suggestions on which options the committee should choose. On page 2 Matthew suggested keeping "*professional development and"* in District Strategic Goal 2.3. On page 5 he suggested using the second option under District Strategic Goal 4.2: "*Continuously develop leaders among all groups".* On page 6, Matthew suggested using a fifth alternative under District Strategic Directions 6: "*Community Collaboration and Value."* He said it seemed the emphasis in this Strategic Direction is community, which is defined to include businesses, cities, etc.

Matthew asked the committee to split into 5 groups to review the strategic directions and goals in light of the suggestions made in *document 8D.* If a group achieves consensus on the strategic direction or goal as it stands, the group should record that. If changing the language would improve the strategic direction or goal, then the group should report those suggestions. If a group thinks an additional goal is needed, then the group should report the suggested addition. Matthew said that what the committee comes up with at the end of this meeting will be sent out to the district community for feedback.

Strategic Directions 1 and 4 and Their Goals – Cheryl (facilitator), DyAnn, Gloria

District Strategic Direction 1. – This group indicated the wording of the Strategic Direction and Goal was fine. They also pointed out that this Strategic Direction addresses planning assumptions 1, 6, 7, and 12.

District strategic Direction 4 - The group indicated the wording of the Strategic Direction and Goals, including the suggested option on Goal 4.2, was fine as written. This Strategic Direction addresses planning assumptions 1, 3, and 5.

The DSPC achieved consensus on District Strategic Directions 1 and 4 and District Strategic Goals 1.1 and 4.1 and 4.2.

Strategic Direction 2 and Its Goals - Troy (facilitator), Keith

This group indicated the wording of District Strategic Direction 2 was acceptable as written, though they suggested that the Board should revisit the wording of the Board Imperative.

Regarding District Strategic Goal 2.1, the group said that SBVC tends to use the word "access" to refer what the college does before the student arrives at the college, and the word "success" to refer to what occurs after the student is enrolled.

Matthew noted that access in the broader meaning of this Strategic Direction includes open classes, availability of counseling, and so on. He asked whether he was correct in saying that this District Goal as written will accommodate the SBVC meaning of access as well as success. Troy replied that it would.

The group said that *"community"* was an ambiguous term, and thought we needed to be clear about our definition of community. Matthew said the intended meaning of it when it was added was the broad community of the potential recipients of the services of the colleges. Troy suggested if we keep "*community"* than we need to add "*community education."* Matthew said that the needs of prospective students are a little better defined than the needs of the community. Matthew asked the committee if we need to eliminate the reference to *"community"* in this particular goal and leave the community reference to Strategic Direction 6. Bruce stated the PDC and ATTC are focused on community and business and industry, and he believes that comes under the learning umbrella as opposed to Strategic Direction 6. Bruce thought we should keep it. Gloria said we need to avoid looking as if a student is not part of the community. Once they come to us and receive whatever service we provide, they are a student. DyAnn said the directive just mentions "*student"* so it is focused on student. Matthew agreed. Bruce said learning does not just take place in the classroom, because the community is part of the experience (e.g., plays, sports events). Matthew said he thinks the meaning is inclusive, and asked if there were any major objections to including "*community"* in the Strategic Goal, and not defining it in the Glossary. The committee had no objections.

The DSPC achieved consensus on District Strategic Direction 2 and District Strategic Goals 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

Strategic Direction 3 and Its Goals – Bruce (facilitator), Glen, John

This group was satisfied that the Strategic Direction and Goals were well stated and supported the goals contained in the colleges' plans.

The DSPC achieved consensus on District Strategic Direction 3 and District Strategic Goals 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Strategic Direction 5 and Its Goal – Kaylee (facilitator), Deb, Damaris

The group concurred with the existing wording.

The DSPC achieved consensus on District Strategic Direction 5 and District Strategic Goal 5.1.

Strategic Direction 6 and Its Goals – Marshall (facilitator), Jackie, Laura

This group accepted the wording option in the District Strategic Direction as suggested by Matthew. They felt in District Strategic Goal 6.1, there were 2 components, and they wanted to emphasize both *development* and *implementation.*

John said that using the word "*development"* implies that nothing is already in place, yet we already do many things in this area. He suggested *"consolidated," "revised," or "enhanced."* Matthew said the group's suggested Goal is to develop a District plan, which we do not have right now. The emphasis is on formalizing a structure to be sure steps are laid out. Bruce stated the district does not have a marketing plan or an outreach plan. After further discussion, the group agreed on more concise wording for Goal 6.1: "Enhance the District's value and image in the communities."

The group also agreed that the word "productive" in Goal 6.2 was unnecessary.

The committee achieved consensus on the District Strategic Direction 6 and the revised District Strategic Goals 6.1 and 6.2.

The District Strategic Planning Committee achieved consensus on <u>all</u> District Strategic Directions and Goals.

VI. Discussion and Possible Revision of Draft *Specifications for Evaluation and Revision (document 8G)*

The DSP must have a provision for review and revision. Matthew thought that in our context, a pretty specific description would be best. This document contains suggestions on both what should happen and who should be involved. Matthew asked if anyone had any suggested changes.

John asked whether an existing body such as District Assembly could do the work, rather than a separate DSPC. Matthew said that since his arrival, virtually everyone who expressed an opinion on the subject had said that District Assembly had not been particularly effective in moving the district forward. Based on that information, Matthew had suggested the DSPC or a successor group, rather than District Assembly.

John said maybe they would be more productive if they had something more substantive to do. He said that this function seems to be appropriate for that group of people.

Troy said that to move something forward, sometimes you need a task force that may include the same members as another group. Giving this task to a body that doesn't move things forward is not going to move it forward. Matthew agreed with Troy. He said that this is a crucial function for the District, and monitoring and evaluating must occur; the Plan can't just sit on the shelf.

Damaris asked, if the members are not being productive in District Assembly, whether they are going to be productive anywhere you put them. Matthew said that productivity can sometimes be limited by a group's structure and history, so that even if it includes very productive people, those people just get frustrated because nothing seems to happen.

Bruce said he thought that we should roll the triennial evaluation into District Assembly, because the constituency leaders select the representatives in District Assembly the same way as in the DSPC. He thinks that District Assembly could focus on District Strategic Planning when the time is right.

Gloria said the charge of District Assembly would need to be changed. She suggested that the decision could be made in the future. Bruce suggested bringing this item to the District Assembly to discuss it. Matthew said that virtually every function in the community colleges is contingent on particular people. If there are fundamental questions about District Assembly as it is currently constituted, that may be an argument for not turning the triennial evaluation over to it.

John suggested leaving the language largely as is, but adding a phrase—"*that the chancellor will identify and/or convene a broadly representative successor body…*" There were no objections to that general approach, so Matthew will tweak the language accordingly. Matthew was wondering how being non-specific will appear to the visiting team. Troy said she thought it would pass the team's "smell test," since we are trying to model a culture of improvement. If we don't empower groups to get involved and be a part of a culture of improvement, it won't happen. Matthew will rewrite this statement and bring it back to the committee.

Matthew asked if there were any other changes or suggestions or gaps. He didn't think there was anything in this list that shouldn't be done by this group to prepare an update of the plan. They all seem to him to be pretty important.

Marshall thought there needs to be a more specific process for the progress reports, to avoid everyone scurrying around at the last minute. Matthew said he is sensitive to the proliferation of committee work, and was reluctant to suggest another structure based on committee work; it seemed appropriate, since the leaders already have a process in place to report progress on the Board Imperatives to the Board, to leave the leaders the flexibility to adopt whatever approach works best for them. There were no other changes suggested.

The committee achieved consensus on the specifications, with the pending change in wording on the successor body.

VII. Glossary Subcommittee

Matthew asked if there were any volunteers to go through the documents we have so far to identify terms that we need to define in one sentence for a reasonably well-informed lay audience. Bruce and Jackie volunteered. Bruce will begin the process and forward his document to Jackie for her review. The deadline is Friday, March 5.

VIII. Next Steps in Process

We are at the point of soliciting input. Matthew hoped everyone has been telling people what we have been doing in staff meetings, Senate meetings and other meetings, so people should be aware of DSPC's general progress, although many may not be aware of the details.

Matthew suggested he prepare a version of *document 8D* that opens with introductory sections (a copy of which he distributed to the committee) that indicate what has gone on so far, requesting feedback and asking for comments on this set of strategic directions and goals. Comments could be submitted electronically to an email address set up by Glen. The DSPC roster will be added to the handout so folks can contact DSPC members also.

If a different group had developed a set of directions and goals, said Matthew, there would have probably been some differences, but there would also have been considerable overlap. The question to the District community is not whether they would have done exactly what we did, but whether they agree that this set of District Strategic Directions and Goals is important to the district over the next 10 years. If they disagree with any item, we need to ask for their specific and concrete suggestions to make the Working Set more persuasive or useful. This is also an opportunity to ask for ideas or concrete steps to be used in formulating objectives. If we see patterns in the suggested steps, that suggests that we need to come up with an objective to address these things. This seems to be the most efficient way to gather information from a broad variety of people.

Troy agreed that the document should be sent out but suggested that people might want to come to a meeting to give feedback. Sending it out and letting them comment verbally would work with our culture.

Matthew said we could hold some open forums. We can also ask people to bring their comments to their next constituent meeting. We need to have some coordination on each campus to see how the forums would work. Matthew said it sounded like the group wanted to send out the document, do constituent group reviews, and hold open forums in 3 locations. These need to be done quickly because feedback needs to be considered at the next meeting if possible.

IX. Other business

A. Meeting Schedule with Locations *(document 8C)*

The new meeting schedule contains the revised locations for all meetings.

X. Homework

A. Review draft glossary.

B. Review feedback on *Working Set*, to be distributed.

C. Review other documents distributed prior to the next meeting.

XI. Adjournment

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary