

## Meeting Minutes

March 1, 2013, 2:00 p.m., PDC 104

**Members Present** – Barbara Nichols, Charlie Ng, Cheryl Marshall, Craig Petinak, Glen Kuck, James Smith, Keith Wurtz, Laura Gowen, Nori Sogomonian, Robert Brown, Robert Levesque, Scott Rippey, Tina Gimple

**Members Absent** – Bruce Baron, Ferny Arana Garcia, Jeremiah Gilbert, Kyle Hundley, Lillian Vasquez, Tanya Rogers

**Guests Present** – Celia Huston

### **Welcome & Introductions**

Introductions were made for the benefit of Celia Huston, from SBVC who was asked by Glen Kuck to attend. Celia is working with accreditation and SLOs at SBVC.

### **Approval of Minutes of February 15, 2013**

The minutes were approved by consensus.

### **Update on Campus Strategic Planning**

Keith reported that Crafton's Ed Master Plan Committee spent a lot of time discussing the Student Success Act and how it would be tied to Crafton's own student success initiative. Regarding CHC's Strategic Plan, a Mission, Visions & Values Survey has been completed and results are to be discussed at their next meeting.

James reported that Valley's College Council has discussed doing a series of surveys and focus groups, the first of which was on the image and character of the campus. Another survey on mission and values will go out, and yet another on strategic direction. SBVC is targeting May 22 for the completion of a plan draft.

### **DSPC Planning – Environmental Scan**

Charlie reiterated that the members of Chancellor's Cabinet agreed to commission an environmental scan for both colleges and the District. This scan will take approximately two months to complete, therefore, the committee's schedule needs to be adjusted. This delay will allow for the development of a more complete list of stakeholders to be included in the District's strategic planning process.

List of Weaknesses

After discussion of the weaknesses defined at the last meeting, the committee went to work refining the list of weaknesses developed at the previous meeting. The score each weakness received is indicated in parenthesis. The committee then proceeded to categorize the weaknesses as indicated by the bracketed words.

1. (8) Ability to attract and retain individuals given current salary structure [BUDGET]
2. (1) Difficulties in adjusting to new ideas and changes
3. (3) Lack of recording and preserving institutional knowledge
4. (2) Uncertainty of future funding structure
5. (7) Multiple systems that are not integrated [SYSTEMS]
6. (6) Capacity to handle basic/development skills students [STUDENT DEMAND]
7. (8) District processes are slow, i.e. budget transfers, hiring, contracts lost, paper-heavy [SYSTEMS]
8. (0) Grant processes
9. (3) Internal customer service
10. (0) Over/under-bearing management
11. (3) Management turnover (SBVC)
12. (5) Lack of flexibility in processes [SYSTEMS]
13. (4) Accountability (performance management process) [MANAGEMENT]
14. (0) Leadership (control issues)
15. (1) Thrifty vs. quality
16. (0) "Red tape"
17. (4) Some policies and procedures not established/antiquated [SYSTEMS]
18. (0) "Summer magic"/transparency
19. (4) Lack of attendance at campus events [CULTURE]
20. (0) Some facilities (student success center, service, etc.)
21. (5) Communication – campus to students, among faculty, staff, administration; District to colleges [COMMUNICATION]
22. (1) Lack of technology (computers, excess printing)
23. (1) Sustainability
24. (1) Two college relationships, EDCT, KVCR
25. (4) Current funding allocation model [BUDGET]
26. (0) No response to resolutions to Board
27. (4) Student success [VISION]
28. (1) District has more focus on SBVC
29. (7) Lack of centralized orientation/training employees (indoctrinate) [MANAGEMENT/SYSTEMS]
30. (3) Ties with industry
31. (2) Lack of an outward focus (SBVC)
32. (1) Entrenched
33. (1) Make assumptions on behalf of students
34. (2) Silos of technology
35. (2) Dependence on County
36. (4) Inadequate staffing levels in certain areas (# of Full-Time Faculty) [BUDGET]
37. (4) Lack of strategic direction for educational programs [VISION/LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT]
38. (1) Implementation of technology
39. (2) Poor career development paths
40. (0) New hire resources provided immediately
41. (3) Hiring process (recruitment and selection) with Mission, Vision and Values
42. (4) Focus on why we're doing it, not just the what and how [CULTURE/VISION/MANAGEMENT]
43. (2) Inability to focus on a few things to do them great
44. (1) Focus on what's possible and not what the rules say
45. (2) Poor planning (grant)

At this time Charlie suspended the discussion on weaknesses so that Cheryl Marshall could make a presentation on strategic directions for the District.

**Strategic Directions Presentation by Cheryl Marshall**

Charlie prefaced the presentation by advising committee members that the Chancellor’s Cabinet, at a retreat on February 26, discussed a move toward becoming a district with two comprehensive colleges, rather than a district with one large college and one that’s not really comprehensive.

On that premise, Cheryl Marshall made a presentation about the future of Crafton Hills College and transformation of the District into one with two comprehensive colleges. In summary, the proposal made to Chancellor’s Cabinet and put forth for the DSPC’s consideration is this:

**Proposal for Reallocation**

A gradual increase of CHC’s allocation from 30% to 34% over the next four years will provide funding that:

- Addresses the pressing population growth on the east end of the valley
- Supports CHC’s development as a comprehensive community college
- Provides space capacity within the District to serve over 20,000 students
- Allows both colleges to regain lost FTEs

<b>Allocation 70% SBVC 30% CHC</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
CHC FTES	3952.01	4031.05	4111.67	4193.90	4277.78
SBVC FTES	9221.36	9405.78	9593.90	9785.78	9981.49
<b>Allocation 66% SBVC 34% CHC by year 2017</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
CHC FTES	3952.01	4165.42	4385.78	4613.29	4848.15
SBVC FTES	9221.36	9271.41	9319.79	9366.39	9411.12

James had a question about some of the data and Keith offered to work with him after the meeting to review the numbers and their sources. Robert Levesque advised that while he felt CHC was positioned well for growth, he thought that the growth would be more from better attendance of the existing students rather than from new students.

Glen felt that the direction being proposed was an important one for the District to explore and Charlie explained that the scenario could only work if there is growth. James considered this strategy a good idea but felt that the assumption of demographic shrinkage in the Valley would need to be thoroughly examined. Cheryl agreed that all figures need to be verified and added that the environmental scan would assist with this.

Charlie commented that, as a District, we need to decide the extent to which we want to serve the population. We need to discuss how the district as a whole can serve the entire Inland Empire. What do we want to do? What difference do we want to make? We need to decide how we best influence the outcome of the District. This is an opportunity that has not been explored before now and Chancellor's Cabinet is excited about it.

Charlie called for a motion that the DSPC pursue a two comprehensive college system. For a definition of "comprehensive college", members were referred to page 9 of the presentation. Robert Brown motioned and Scott Rippy seconded to move forward with the recommendation for the District to move toward becoming a two comprehensive college district. Glenn would like to have the Board discuss this and Charlie advised that if the committee so supported this recommendation, then the Board would have the same discussion at its March 14 meeting. The implications of this recommendation, if the motioned carried, would be discussed throughout the spring, summer and fall.

The motion was put to a vote. James Smith was opposed, but all others voted to make the recommendation, and the motion carried.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned. The committee will plan to refine the weakness list at their next gathering on March 29, 2013, 2-4 p.m. in PDC 104.