

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

**Minutes
March 12, 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
Scott Rippey, CHC Faculty
Dr. John Stankas, SBVC 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 26, 2010

The February 26, 2010 minutes were approved by consensus.

III. Review and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on the *Edited Transcript of Posted Comments (document 9H)*, on the *Working Set of District Strategic Directions and Goals with College Goals and Objectives (document 9A)*, or on the *Working Set of Strategic Directions and Goals (document 9B)*. There were no questions or objections.

IV. Review of Revised Major Planning Assumptions (document 9F)

Two items on the initial draft were changed based on the discussion at the last meeting: 1) Student learning should be driving what we are doing; and 2) Attention to the changing communities. Matthew went over his changes asking if anyone had any objections to the new language. None did, so the committee has consensus on the set of 13 planning assumptions.

V. Review of Revised Specifications for Evaluation and Revision (document 9G)

Matthew said that in his view, the Accrediting Commission will prefer considerable specificity in the evaluation process. Based on discussion at the last meeting, Matthew suggested language and asked committee members if they had any comments or questions on the new language.

There were no questions or objections. Matthew said that with that consensus, these specifications for evaluation and revision will be incorporated into the District Strategic Plan.

VI. Review of Draft Glossary of Terms (document 9D) and Glossary of Acronyms (document 9E)

Documents 9D and 9E were drafted by Bruce and Jackie. Matthew asked if this glossary of terms and acronyms works well. He also asked members to note and suggest definitions for any future items encountered in discussions that might need to be added to the glossary. At Jackie's suggestion, Matthew will add "district" and "district office" with proposed definitions to the glossary list. Whether the definition for "district resource allocation model" is a formula or a process was discussed. Bruce said the model is the formula but that there is also a process, so he suggested we identify both. Matthew suggested adding, "is part of a larger resource allocation process" after the word "operations." He thought "formula" is a little too narrow, and we might be trying to be a little too tight. After more discussion, the committee agreed to replace "formula" with "overall process." John thought the definition for Program Review is hard to read. John will draft alternative language to the Program Review definition. With the addition of the two terms, the change to the definition of "district resource allocation model," and pending approval of the revision by John, the committee reached consensus on the Glossary contents. Matthew noted that the glossary of terms and acronyms might well be viewed by folks in the community, so we want to be as clear as we can as often as we can. Matthew thanked Jackie and Bruce for putting together the glossary of terms and acronyms.

VII. Breakout, Report and Action: District Objectives

Matthew distributed an *Excerpt from Goals, Subgoals, Objectives and Activities: What's the Difference?* (document 9I). He explained that an objective is a concrete, measurable milestone on the way to achieving a goal. An objective is typically what you are going to do. The outcome is what happens as a result of what you have done. Matthew said the committee would be working on objectives—what we are going to do. It will be under Measures of Progress that the distinction between objectives and outcomes comes into play. Matthew reviewed the characteristics of a sound objective. He said each group needed to draft one or two objectives under each of the goals that we regard as the most pressing to get moving on these goals. The objective should include the point person(s) with the overall responsibility of monitoring progress. The point person is not necessarily the person who does all the work, but is the "nag," or the person who coordinates getting the tasks completed. Achievement of the objective represents progress on the goal. You will be focusing on one or two objectives under each goal next year to move forward, and then might well replace those objectives with others to move forward further. Objectives must be specific, reasonable and measurable. Actions or activities fall under objectives and move them forward. There were no questions about the nature of an objective.

Matthew provided examples of specific suggested objectives on document 9J and blanks to fill in objectives recommended by the subgroups. Matthew assigned the following task to the breakout groups: Based on the College Goals and Objectives and the Committee's previous discussions, formulate one to three focused objectives for each of your assigned District Goals and report out.

Matthew said his examples are intended to provide an idea of scope and a range of choices. The focus of the first example is on communication. Measures of progress can be qualitative or quantitative or both. The "nag" is the coordinator that makes sure things happen as planned

and can report back the results. The subgroups were directed to complete at least one objective for each goal and then, time permitting, go back and add additional objectives.

The following subgroups worked on Objectives for their assigned District Goals:

Strategic Directions 1 and 4 – Keith (facilitator), DyAnn

Strategic Direction 2 – Scott (facilitator), John

Strategic Direction 3 - Bruce (facilitator), Gloria

Strategic Direction 5 - Damaris (facilitator), Deb

Strategic Direction 6 – Marshall (facilitator), Laura, Jackie

[See document 10F for a report of all draft objectives.]

Matthew asked the subgroups to turn in their suggested objectives, so that he could compile the results in one document. Everyone will have an opportunity to review them, think about additions in terms of measurements and actions, and also think about gaps. The committee will revisit the draft objectives next time. Matthew said he would make suggestions on wording in keeping with sound practice.

VIII. Preliminary Feedback Report (document 9C)

Matthew distributed the report of feedback received to date (document 9C).

IX. Other Business

X. Homework

- A. Forward feedback on *Working Set* to Matthew for compilation.
- B. Review feedback report to be distributed March 24.
- C. Review draft Objectives and bring suggested changes or additions to next meeting.
- D. Review other documents distributed prior to the next meeting.
- E. Have a wonderful Spring Break!

XI. Adjournment

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary