

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

**Minutes
January 29, 2010**

PRESENT

Damaris Castillo-Torres, Student, SBVC
Larry Ciecalone, President, KVCR
Dr. Deb Daniels, President, SBVC
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
Scott Rippy, Academic Senate, CHC
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC
DyAnn Walter, Classified Staff, District
Keith Wurtz, Researcher, CHC
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

Welcome and Introductions

Matthew welcomed everyone.

Minutes – January 15, 2010

The January 15, 2010 minutes were approved by consensus.

Review and Action: Suggested District Strategic Direction 6 and Goals 6.1 and 6.2

Matthew highlighted the changes the committee had made on the *Working Set (document 6B)*, which he believed accurately reflected what the committee did last week. He had suggested some specific language for item 3.1.1 under District strategic goal 3.1; the committee agreed by consensus to revise it as follows: "Develop and implement a system for training employees."

The committee agreed by consensus on the language of District strategic goals 6.1 and 6.2 as recommended by the breakout group at the previous meeting.

Review of and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on *document 6A*. No one had any questions.

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on *document 6B*. Troy asked what is meant by community collaboration and suggested that we might want to simplify that. Matthew said that when we review the *Working Set Strategic Directions and Goals* for which we retained phrasing options, we can discuss all of these issues and reach consensus on final recommended language.

Matthew asked if there were any questions for the preparers of the subcommittee reports. Matthew will prepare a summary of the implications of all those reports that incorporates the substance of our discussions as well. At that point, we will determine any modifications to the goals that are suggested by the subcommittees' work. Each subcommittee was asked to discuss the implications of its report. Matthew said we want the language to be clear, but some things may end up on the glossary.

Subcommittee members Cheryl and Kaylee submitted their report (*document 6H*) on 1) *Pedagogical Innovations* and 2) *Accountability and Learning Outcomes*. No one had any questions.

Subcommittee topic *Educational attainment in relation to economic opportunity (document 6I)* was done by Matthew. No one had any questions.

Subcommittee topic *Competition for students (document 6J)* was done by Matthew. Matthew said that Kevin developed a mapping of all educational institutions within a 60-minute driving radius that might represent competition for CHC and SBVC. Matthew said he focused on San Bernardino and Riverside Counties in his summary. Kevin included anything that had to do with education. Matthew selected those categories that are most likely to be direct competitors (other than colleges and universities, whose competitive position is self-evident), and said some of these institutions would compete with us for courses but not degrees. We are surrounded by a lot of competition.

Subcommittee members Laura, Marshall and Troy submitted their report on *Private support for education, including grant opportunities (document 6K)*. No one had any questions.

Matthew complimented the groups who turned in subcommittee reports for analyzing a lot of information and compiling the issues into concise documents. He then opened the meeting for discussion of the reports.

Cheryl stated that regarding accountability and assessment (*document 6H*), students are becoming more aware of SLOs. The fact that we are getting pressure from WASC and the DOE means there is a need to advise students and faculty and alleviate their fears the best we can. Regarding on-line courses, Cheryl said they are convenient because of time but there is also a perception that they are easier. The difficulty of the on-line course depends on how it is taught. The same level of rigor needs to be applied to on-line courses as in the classroom.

Troy asked whether we going to have so much on-line that we don't have to worry about classroom space. She said that many students take the on-line courses but do not have the technological skills they need to complete the course and become successful. Perhaps they need an orientation or a certain skill level before they take the course. Glen said historically the District has had two course management systems so that students have to re-learn if they migrate from one course management system to another. The way an instructor teaches also could be different under the different course management systems. That situation will be

simplified with the adoption of Blackboard as the course management system standard for both colleges starting in Fall 2010.

After some discussion about faculty evaluations, Matthew said it appeared that SBVC is moving in the direction of having evaluations of on-line instructors. The same might not be true of CHC, although CHC did use course evaluations in all on-line courses for the first time last fall. It was determined that the faculty evaluation instrument is the same across the district, but the instrument is not contained in the faculty contract.

Glen said the California Community Colleges Systems Office has been rolling out centralized admission applications through CCCApply. A student can opt for whatever institution is offering on-line courses. Matthew asked whether the feeling in this district is that growth in on-line courses is inevitable. The consensus answer was yes. Glen said we have moved from 1% to 11% of the number of total courses which are now offered on-line in a very short time. Scott suggested development of a manual or handbook for students so that they can learn to use the on-line software. Glen said there are tutorials available in Blackboard. Matthew asked if a tutorial or something like that is required before one can "dive in" to an on-line course because some institutions require that. Scott said we shouldn't have such training as a pre-requisite. On-line students could register for their class and their orientation could occur in the first class meeting.

The information on the economic advantages of going to college (*document 6I*) reflects common knowledge. Matthew found most enlightening the continuing substantial increase in the three years after the first year of employment. Most of the implications he listed are most relevant from a planning standpoint when we are in a growth mode. We need to sell the fact that people can make more money when coming to a community college. Troy noted that there is an opportunity for us to educate people that getting classes at institutions that are accredited is very important. Matthew said that there had been a change in the law in California recently regarding the accountability of proprietary institutions, such that they were no longer required by the State to post their placement rates. Gloria said, however, that if they are accredited, they are required by the accrediting agency to post their placement rates. Matthew noted that the traditional argument in favor of the proprietary schools is that they can "get you out in two years."

Matthew asked if there were any additional comments on *document 6K*. Marshall said there should be incentives for writing a grant. Today, if someone writes a grant, it is most often an extra burden on them. Four-year schools often grant release time and/or extra compensation to write the grant. Deb stated that release time in community colleges goes against the 50 percent law. Troy said their subcommittee's highlights and implications aimed at requiring some action and exploring the ideas presented. Matthew said one approach could be to convene a task force to investigate the feasibility of X, Y or Z idea, and to establish whether or not legal barriers prohibit certain initiatives.

Matthew said he will prepare a consolidated report of subcommittee findings after the next meeting, when all of the reports are in.

Breakout and Report: Implications of Effectiveness and Impact Indicators and Environmental Scan Results

Matthew asked the committee to break into four groups to consider and record the main implications of the effectiveness and impact indicators and the latest round of environment scan results.

Group A – Glen, Scott, DyAnn

Graphs on Success and Productivity (documents 6C-6F).

Report from Group A

Documents 6C and 6D indicate fill rates and retention and pass rates. The fill and pass rates are about the same for both colleges, but CHC's success and retention rates were higher than SBVC's. It is likely that student preparation coming into the colleges has an impact. We might want to allocate more money for student support to SBVC so they can deal with that gap. They looked at WSCH and FTEF (also known as Faculty Load). Enrollments have been up the last two years and WSCH per FTEF somewhat flat. CHC's WSCH per FTEF was higher but the gap was narrowing over the last few years. Deb stated a higher proportion of faculty devoted to technical programs, as at SBVC, will lower the number of WSCH per FTEF, so we might never close that gap.

Group B- Gloria, Deb, Keith

ARCC Indicators (document 6G), with Posted Comments from 12/11 review of ARCC (document 4I).

Report from Group B

Within ARCC, this group identified the primary areas they were concerned about, which were SPAR and Basic Skills success.

The group mapped the information learned from ARCC data to three goal categories: student success and readiness; system effectiveness; and resource development.

Group C – Cheryl and Kaylee

ARCC Demographics (document 6G) and CoE Service Area Demographics (documents 6PA-J and 6Q).

Loma Linda students tend to go to CHC, probably because they attend Redlands High School. Students residing in Redlands attend both SBVC and CHC. It is good that students from all over go to both colleges because of the different programs offered. Each campus has about the equivalent number of males vs. females. The data indicate households are smaller in the eastern valley (CHC) than the western valley (SBVC). The population in the eastern valley tends to be older. Household size may have an effect on economic factors. It may be beneficial to both colleges to reach out to alumni who have obtained degrees and ask them to help the colleges. We need to think about how we can reach out to those students who have started their education but have not finished. The eastern valley is much less racially diverse than the western valley.

Report from Group C

Group D – Troy, Larry, Marshall, Laura

Other Environmental Scan Results: Jobs and Businesses (documents 6M, 6N, 6PK, 6PL1-2), with Posted comments from 12/18 review of job and occupational projections (document 5A).

Report from Group D

This group looked at future demands and projected growth in the occupational projections and looked at sustainable wages. What are we doing to “future proof” our colleges? What are we doing to position ourselves for “green jobs”? We have always had a sort of tension between the colleges and the PDC. The PDC could pilot future programs, and the colleges could piggyback on the PDC, which is already involved in recertification. Many competing institutions are not accredited and students spend lots of money to attend those institutions. We need to build community partners. We have one of the largest GIS firms in the country within the District. We need a marketing plan. We have lots of ideas but how do we market them? We need to match our programs to both current demand and future projections. Let’s say a program is down in enrollment but we see some future job growth in the area. Do we handle that? We need to “grow” the right program to match the job growth.

Matthew noted that the committee needs to ask questions of data, and recognize when the methodology affects the results of a study. For example, some of the charts are based on zip code. In this case, it is the last or latest zip code on record, which is not necessarily the one the student had when he or she attended the colleges. When the committee looks at ethnic information, members should be aware that the US Census makes a distinction between ethnicity (Hispanic versus non-Hispanic) and race that the community colleges do not mirror. So mapping ethnicities at the colleges to ethnicity and race in surrounding cities directly from the Center of Excellence data is not possible.

Homework

Continue subcommittee work.

The following submitted reports are due February 3 for the February 5 meeting:

1. Glen, John, Larry, DyAnn (Technology issues and trends related to education)
2. Scott and Raquel (Federal financial aid and grant opportunities)

Review principal patterns and trends in environmental scan results, to be distributed by February 3.

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary