

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

**Minutes
March 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
Dr. Glen Kuck, Executive Director, DETS, District
Scott Rippey, CHC Faculty
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC
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 – March 12, 2010

The March 12, 2010 minutes were approved by consensus.

III. Review and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

Matthew asked if there were any clarifying questions on the *Glossary of Terms* (document 10A), *Glossary of Acronyms* (document 10B), the *Working Set of Strategic Directions and Goals with College Goals and Objectives, February 26, 2010* (document 10C), *Major Planning Assumptions* (document 10D), and the *Specifications for Evaluation and Revisions* (document 10E). These documents reflect the changes made at the last meeting. There were no questions or objections.

IV. Review of Draft of Glossary Terms (document 10A) and Glossary of Acronyms (document 10B)

There were no objections to retaining the plural form in the definition of “FTES” in document 10B. The group accepted the recommended changes.

Matthew went through the changes and modifications. He asked if there were any other acronyms that needed to be added to the glossary. Gloria suggested adding SAO (Service Area Outcome). Matthew will make that modification.

Matthew said documents 10A and 10B will be combined to make one glossary. He asked if there were any other suggestions or changes in Document 10A. Glen said DETS is on the south end of the administration building. The entities that comprise the “District” are District Office, CHC, SBVC, KVCR and EDTC/PDC. In answer to a member’s question, Matthew said he didn’t think the bond program was mentioned anywhere in the Strategic Plan, but it would fall under the Chancellor in the District Office.

John provided a proposed revision to “Program Review. Document 10H contains his proposal, the initial definition by Jackie and Bruce, and Matthew’s suggested revision. Matthew pointed out that these definitions are intended to be descriptive, not prescriptive. Matthew’s definition combines elements of both John’s and Jackie and Bruce’s definitions. Troy asked whether “stakeholders” were defined in the glossary. That term could refer to a consulting group or the community, depending on our definition. Matthew suggested “involves input from constituency groups and may involve input from other stakeholders.” We do have a definition of constituency groups. We do not have a definition of stakeholders. Matthew asked if we should call out advisory committees separately. Keith liked having them separate. Scott said saying constituent groups and advisory groups is a good way to go. Troy said it might be helpful to include every three years rather than regularly, since Program Review occurs every three years. Scott suggested keeping “regularly” so we don’t have to go back to make changes if the rules change, and added he didn’t have a problem with “regularly” because we are going to follow the law anyway. After further discussion, the committee reached consensus on the following definition of Program Review: “A process by which a program or service regularly evaluates its efficacy. Its purpose is continuous improvement of the program or service. It is evidence-based, involves input from constituency groups and advisory committees, and results in a report that includes planned improvements.”

V. Review and Possible Action: Feedback Received on Strategic Directions and Goals (document 10G)

Matthew asked the committee to consider in turn the feedback from the emails, from each of the three open forums, and from the CHC Academic Senate. We need to document that all this feedback is being considered in a serious way, whether or not we ultimately make changes based on it. The fundamental question is whether there is a compelling reason for changing a strategic direction or goal based on the feedback.

Email Feedback No. 01 – Scott asked if human resources are included in Goal 3.1. Matthew said yes. There were no further comments.

Email Feedback No. 02 – There were no compelling arguments for making any changes.

Email Feedback No. 03 – There were no compelling arguments for making any changes.

Email Feedback No. 04 – Troy said she thought the System Strategic Plan is giving us good direction. If we can embrace some of their items that we need anyway, it would be good to use them.

Email Feedback No. 05 – There were no compelling arguments for making any changes.

Document 10I: CHC Academic Senate Discussion

Matthew said that the only item he saw that might rise to a potential goal or objective was #19 on reducing separatism among the sites. One of the main purposes of the objectives is to reinforce and support what is being done at the colleges. Matthew asked whether there should be something specific about interdependence or working in a more coordinated fashion among the sites under Institutional Effectiveness. Glen said the very first time all District Office staff came together was for the program review meetings at the district level. He thought that would be a healthy direction to go. Troy said it is always good to refer back to our mission and thought it would be important to look at the mission statement to see if it aligns with the colleges' plans. She thought it would also allow the individual identities of the colleges to come forth. Glen suggested that we have some additional goal or objective that explicitly addresses coordination or interdependence promoted between the sites. Marshall said he thought it fit under Institutional Effectiveness. We are coordinated to support students and outcomes. Somehow the decision-making has to support students and outcomes.

Gloria said each campus has its culture, but she always saw the District not as a separate entity but as a support function to be sure the colleges had what they needed. She said she is concerned that the role is not understood. Glen said he was not suggesting that we emphasize the separate entities, but rather how we collaborate and better serve the colleges. Gloria said she didn't think we do that by identifying the District as a separate entity. Matthew suggested that language something like "facilitate collaboration across the District" might address these concerns. Matthew said it is true that we are after integration of effort across the District. The DSP is not simply the sum of the colleges' plans. It aligns with the college plans, but it also provides an umbrella and support. Glen said we can emphasize how we collaborate and support the colleges.

Troy explained her thoughts with a drawing of a flow chart. When the district makes a decision, people ask how that decision will be implemented. She drew the students at the top of her flow chart, the colleges on the side and the district on the bottom. Matthew suggested that the group that is working on strategic direction one take this into consideration and draft some language that does not emphasize the separateness. Keith, who facilitates the SD1 group, indicated that he would include collaboration in an objective.

Matthew asked if there were any items at the open forum held at the District that indicated a need for changing a goal or objective (document 10G). Glen asked how Board Imperatives are identified. Gloria said the former chancellor identified the Board Imperatives. Matthew said this group could recommend revisiting the Board Imperatives. There were no other comments.

Matthew asked if there were any suggested changes based on the feedback from the SBVC and CHC forums. He said many of the questions and comments dealt with clarifications—of the process, the phases, and so on. Matthew asked in both College forums whether anyone took exception to any of the goals or directions, and none did. The committee did not see the need for any changes to Strategic Directions or Goals based on the feedback at the open forums.

Matthew reported that he had asked the presidents of all six senates to discuss this plan in their senate meetings, and asked for a schedule of meetings because he would be happy to attend if they wished. The only group Matthew received any feedback from was the CHC Academic Senate (document 10I above).

In response to a question, Matthew reminded the committee that KVCR is not being emphasized in Phase 1. Phase I emphasizes alignment with the colleges' plans.

VI. Breakout, Report and Action: *Draft Objectives with Worksheet, March 12, 2010*
(document 10F)

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

Strategic Direction 2 – Scott (facilitator), Troy

Strategic Direction 3 - Gloria (facilitator), Glen

Strategic Direction 5 - Damaris (facilitator), Deb

Strategic Direction 6 – Marshall (facilitator), Laura

Matthew said he had attempted to do some clarification in his edits of document 10F, and asked the committee members to let him know if they had any corrections. Matthew asked the committee members whether they had any clarifying questions or suggestions on any of these objectives. He asked the individual facilitators in each small group to take notes on any comments related to objectives under their Strategic Direction.

Matthew reviewed briefly some of the draft objectives. He said that the development of an objective should take into consideration how it can be measured. If you cannot think of a way to measure progress, then it probably isn't a good objective. He noted that Objectives 2.1.1 and 2.2.1 both begin with the word "support," which he regards as too vague for a strong objective. However, he thought it would work here because support of the Colleges is what the district does. Matthew said the small group could consider a better word.

Matthew understood 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 to mean two complementary aspects of support, one for the classroom and the other for support services. Objectives 2.3.1, 3.1.1, and 4.2.1 are all related to training and professional development.

Matthew asked again if there were any questions on specific objectives that needed to be brought to the attention of the small groups. Troy thought that 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 looked too much like mandates. Glen said that training should be a part of 1.1.1. Hearing no other comments, Matthew said he would assume that everyone is okay with the other objectives. The committee gathered into its small groups. Matthew asked all the groups to look at the existing language again to see if any changes are appropriate; to refine the measures; to refine the suggested Actions, and to consider whether additional objectives are warranted, given the feedback and discussion. He asked the groups to be specific about suggested actions. All but one group recorded its suggestions on the worksheets and turned them in to Matthew for transcribing. The remaining group requested additional time for discussion after the meeting; Matthew asked them to submit their changes to him by April 2.

VII. Other Business

VIII. Homework

- A. Review any remaining draft objectives and bring suggested changes or additions to the next meeting.
- B. Review other documents distributed prior to the next meeting.

IX. Adjournment

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary