

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

**Minutes
April 9, 2010**

PRESENT

Bruce Baron, Acting Chancellor
Damaris Castillo-Torres, Student, SBVC
Larry Cicalone, President, KVCR
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. Cheryl Marshall, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, CHC
Scott Rippy, CHC Faculty
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC
Keith Wurtz, Researcher, CHC
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

I. Welcome and Introductions

Matthew welcomed everyone.

II. Approval of Minutes – March 26, 2010

The March 26, 2010 minutes were approved by consensus with some corrections on those present.

III. Review and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on the *Glossary* (document 11A). Matthew merged the glossaries into one document and made the changes which were discussed last meeting. *Message Deck* was a new term, the definition of which is an adaptation of what Larry sent Matthew. The question was raised about having two glossaries. Bruce said one alpha list is more convenient. Matthew suggested sending it out in its current condition, and if feedback indicates there is an issue, we can make a change.

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on the *Working Set of Strategic Directions and Goals with College Goals and Objectives, February 26, 2010* (document 11B). He had added some updates to the CHC objectives in document 11B. There were no questions.

IV. Additions to Glossary (document 11A)

Matthew asked if anyone had any additions to the Glossary (document 11A). Troy suggested adding the term "Cohort." Matthew said we would probably get some other suggestions in the feedback. Larry noted *stations* need to be the plural form. Matthew asked the committee to

continue thinking about any other terms. The last time the committee can add to the Glossary will be at the next meeting. Marshall suggested adding *CalPASS*. Matthew said that if it is mentioned in the DSP, he will add it. Jackie suggested adding P&PRC. Matthew said that if it appears in the DSP, he will add it.

V. Discussion and Action: *Draft Objectives, April 4, 2010 (document 11C)*

This document contained the results of the discussion held with all of the groups. Matthew edited some things. Matthew asked if anyone not on a group had any questions or issues with that group's suggestions.

The Committee turned to Item VI on the agenda while additional photocopies were made of document 11C.

VI. Update on Schedule

Matthew reported that Chancellor's Cabinet had requested an acceleration of the schedule, to the effect that the committee's final Phase 1 recommendation will come to the Chancellor before the end of this semester, instead of in the fall. Matthew will prepare the front matter and integration/alignment table and assemble the full draft before the next meeting for committee review. After the committee reaches consensus on the distribution draft, Bruce will send out the draft to all employees for feedback by email or through DSPC representatives. Both Presidents concluded that a single open forum at each College would suffice for the campus presentations.

Matthew said recorders will be available at the open forums. The schedule at present calls for the CHC forum to be on the 28th, 29th, or 30th. The Valley forum might occur the same week. All the feedback received should be seriously considered at our meeting on May 7. The deadline for submission of feedback to the email address and to DSPC members is 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday, May 5. Matthew will compile all the feedback into a document that he will send to DSPC on Thursday, May 6. He acknowledged the short turnaround time for committee review of the feedback, but asked committee members to make enough time to review the feedback before the May 7 meeting.

The question for members to consider as they review the feedback is whether it makes a compelling argument to change the goals or objectives in the plan. The final Phase 1 recommendation will be given to the Chancellor after the meeting on May 14. That will be the committee's last opportunity to think about the feedback and make the final cut. Matthew said this group has done wonderful work in putting together all of the elements of this plan in an efficient manner. Assuming the Chancellor accepts the committee's recommendation, that will be the District's Strategic Plan going into 2010-11. Bruce said the plan will then be accepted by the Board in June.

Matthew invited all the DSPC members to attend the open forums to comment on the process and answer any questions. Gloria said the college will have a date and time for the CHC forum by Monday. Matthew asked Bruce to send out a heads-up to everyone that the DSP will be distributed about April 26th so they can set aside some time to review the plan, to attend the forums, and send feedback through email. If we have the information from Gloria and Deb regarding the open forums, that will be included in Bruce's email.

The committee returned to Item V on the Agenda.

V. Discussion and Action: Draft Objectives, April 4, 2010 (document 11C)--continued

Troy said she had some cautionary feedback based on what she learned from another multi-campus district where the college was trying to meet the requirements of the district plan. She said this plan is a lot to operationalize. She suggested that the district decide which two strategic directions to emphasize each year because that makes it a lot easier for people to focus and achieve progress.

Troy also noted that it is okay to develop and evaluate something, but you also have to report on how it improved based on the evaluation results. She felt that the multi-campus district she mentioned had forgotten about the work that the colleges had to do. To make it easier, the district should perhaps identify what is important to focus on each year. Everything in this plan is very important, but everything is not always doable.

Matthew said one way to do what Troy is talking about is phasing the objectives—indicate which ones would be 2010-11 items and which would be 2011-12 items in the timelines, for example. In addition, he said it is important to remember that each of the colleges has an Educational Master Plan, under which it will be working on items that contribute to this DSP.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on District Objectives 1.1.1. and 1.1.2. had any comments or suggestions on them. Hearing none, Matthew said he assumed they would appear as is in the distribution draft.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on District Objective 2.1.1 had any comments or suggestions on it. Hearing none, Matthew said he assumed it would appear as is in the distribution draft.

Matthew asked if anybody believed a new objective was necessary under Goal 2.2 to cover Career Pathways, which the committee has discussed in the last round of feedback. Troy said she had suggested adding something about career pathways. Cheryl agreed that it needed to be included some place. Scott said he would draft an additional objective under 2.2.

Matthew asked for clarification or comments on 2.2.4. Bruce said he is concerned that this is a collective bargaining issue. Scott said the idea was that the lower the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, the more time each full-time faculty member has to spend on all the other work outside the classroom for which they are responsible. When you raise the ratio, you have more faculty members among whom to spread the work. Matthew said that that translates into increasing the hours taught by full-time faculty collectively. Troy suggested that we monitor the impact on faculty and then go into negotiations. Matthew asked Scott to take the comments of Bruce and Troy into consideration.

Bruce's concern on 2.2.4 is that if it stays as written, we will fail to achieve it, because there are too many other implications and issues that affect our ability to make it happen. A feasibility clause was suggested. Bruce suggested formulating an objective that involved an established target of full-time to part-time ratios within a plan to achieve it. He said that would be more manageable. Scott agreed with Bruce's comment. Matthew said this discussion connects nicely with the staffing plan HR is working on. Troy said that at SBVC, there are too many people that aren't participating in those committee tasks. She would want to see if there is an increase in attendance at meetings as we pursue this objective. Matthew said we might add monitoring the participation of faculty on committees. Bruce said that the action under 1.1.1 could be made broader to say that all shared governance committee members be trained in

their participation. Scott said that that is part of the Educational Master Plan at CHC. Troy said that SBVC faculty are trained, but too many still do not show up. Marshall thought it was a critical issue to improve efficiency overall, and he saw the need more under Goals 4.1 and 4.2. Laura suggested a template for committee members. Keith will consider these comments under SD 4.

Matthew noted that we have always said that the Goals are not mutually exclusive. To a certain extent, deciding the Goal under which to put an objective is a judgment call. Matthew asked group 2 to draft something on this issue, and the committee can decide later where it should go.

Bruce said he was concerned that 2.2.2 could certainly be a problematic objective, given the budget. He suggested an objective to develop a plan to determine appropriate levels of staffing needed to provide student support services. Matthew suggested developing a plan would be the objective, and the actions would include determining appropriate support levels for these services. Troy thought *institutionalize* was too strong. Bruce said this is really a college prioritization issue rather than a district objective. Scott said he agrees with Bruce in light of the new budget model. Matthew said it sounds like 2.2.2 is a referral to the colleges and can be removed from this plan. The committee agreed.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on the objectives under SD 3 had any comments or suggestions on them. Regarding 3.1.1, Troy asked if we could use a term different from *develop*. Group 3 will consider the changes and come up with language that meets the request.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on the objectives under SD 4 had any comments or suggestions on them. Troy said we should also be looking at the functional relations of the district and colleges, as well as the governance structures. Matthew said this might be an additional objective under 4.1. Troy suggested maybe under SD 1. Keith said his group will look at where to put the objective on functional relationships.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on the objectives under SD 5 had any comments or suggestions on them. Damaris will clarify the diversity question Jackie raised under the objective. Matthew asked whether the intent for the calendar was to include only events that are district-wide in scope, or all events regardless of where they occurred in the district. Damaris responded the intent was the latter. Matthew asked Damaris to change the wording.

Matthew asked whether anybody that did not work on the objectives under SD 6 had any comments or suggestions on them. Cheryl said 6.2 overlaps with the pathways issue. Bruce suggested that, rather than be so specific on a Business Advisory Roundtable, we need to look at all opportunities for partnerships. Cheryl suggested the objective needs to be broadened. Jackie mentioned linking the PDC to the colleges. Marshall will incorporate these comments. Troy would like to see advisory group information housed somewhere like the district website. Marshall will address this issue also.

Matthew asked the committee to break out into the following groups to incorporate these suggestions, and they did so.

1 & 4 - Keith

2 - Cheryl, Troy, Scott

- 3 - Bruce, Gloria
- 5 - Damaris, Kaylee
- 6 - Marshall, Larry, Jackie, Laura

VII. Other Business

VIII. Homework

Matthew emphasized the importance of the April 23rd meeting. He will do his best to get the draft to the DSPC early in the week of the meeting and asked everyone to put time on the calendar to review the draft of the plan, just as we are going to ask the staff to set aside some time to review the plan.

- A. Review assembled draft and brings suggested changes or additions to the next meeting.
- B. Review other documents distributed prior to the next meeting.

IX. Adjournment

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary