

Meeting Minutes

October 8, 2010, 10-12 noon, ATTC 120

Members Present

Charlie Ng, Courtney Hunter, Damaris Castillo-Torres, Glen Kuck, Gloria Harrison, Jackie Wingler, Kaylee Hrisoulas, Larry Cicalone, Matthew Isaac, Matthew Lee

Welcome & Introductions

Charlie welcomed everyone.

Approval of Minutes

The September 24, 2010 meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

Review and Discussion of Progress Report Form

The committee reviewed a progress report form to facilitate reporting of point persons to the committee on their objectives. The form could provide consistency in reporting and act as an effective means of documentation of the committee's progress. Committee members agreed by consensus to use the form as a reporting tool. Larry asked that the Word version be forwarded to committee members. Matthew Lee mentioned that Jason Brady has begun working on a feasibility study regarding the development of an online version of the form.

Review and Discussion of Strategic Issues, Including Possible Additions

Committee members reviewed the DSP Strategic Issues as listed on pages 15-20 of the plan, which are listed here with their original point persons.

- Budget, Law & Regulation, Capital Funding (Bruce Baron)
- Pedagogical Innovations, Accountability, and Learning Outcomes (Cheryl Marshall)
- Educational Attainment in Relation to Economic Opportunity (Matthew Lee)
- Competition for Students (Kevin Fleming's report)
- Private Support for Education, Including Grant Opportunities (?)
- Technology Issues and Trends Related to Education (Glen Kuck, Larry Cicalone)
- Financial Aid (Scott Rippy)

Matthew Lee indicated that this task encompassed two issues – 1) updating of the current topics, and 2) determination of any new strategic topics that should be added. Charlie mentioned that as a District we need to look at what kind of programs and services are being offered, as well as how big we want to be. Given our current population and provided certain funding, we could get up to 20,000 students, perhaps.

Glen brought up that the committee still needs to define the District's and the District entities' relationship to the colleges. For example, the colleges define their vision for how they serve the community, and the District provides the support to help them accomplish that. Such a direction has not been published.

Charlie shared with the committee a recent discussion from Chancellor's Cabinet in which it was agreed that at this time the San Bernardino Community College District is not in a position to impact the community as a District entity, like, for example, a K-12 District does. Therefore, the role of the District is one of support to the colleges, similar to the office of the president for the UC system. The District's job is to help the instructional and student services programs be as effective as possible, much like the role of a facilities department. Only the Chancellor's office holds authority over the colleges. One possible concern with this position, however, is that the District as a whole may be missing out on an opportunity for some level of coordination among the colleges, KVCR and PDC.

Matthew Lee brought up objective 4.1.2., *Periodically evaluate, enhance, and document the functional relationships among district entities*. He recommended that the committee promptly review the functional relationship Charlie has described, come to a consensus, and communicate that consensus, thereby fulfilling this objective. At that point, the DSPC can discuss its coordinative function so that the District is able to move forward, as a whole, with greater effectiveness and efficiency.

Matthew Lee also mentioned the strategic function of the committee. Certain strategic issues – for example, overall District growth, facilities master plans, etc. – impact Crafton, SBVC, KVCR and EDCT equally. Glen asked if the DSPC's boundaries might not, at some point, become blurred with those of the District Assembly. Matthew Lee advised that at this point the District Assembly is *not* a strategic planning body. Beyond this year, however, the DSPC will be making a recommendation on which body will succeed itself.

Gloria mentioned that the recently developed Resource Allocation Model was one catalyst for the discussion of formally saying that the District is a service entity, not a body of authority.

The committee turned its attention toward developing a primer for the discussion of this issue at the next meeting and developed the following ideas about the relationship of the District to the colleges.

Services	Constraints	(Advisory)
<u>District Office Support</u>	<u>District Office Support Coordination</u>	<u>District Coordination</u>
- Tech (training)	- Tech Standards	- Policies & Procedures
- HR (training, safety)	- Equipment Standards	
- Fiscal (safety)		
- Facilities Planning	District Authority -- Chancellor & Presidents	
- Police	Functions Office – (like maintenance, etc.)	

Resource Allocation Discussion – Who Pays for What?



In response to a question from Glen, Matthew Lee advised that this committee is an advisory body to the Chancellor for action, procedure, plan, etc. The Chancellor's Cabinet discussion has provided a starting point for the DSPC to develop a recommendation back to the Chancellor on a publication that lays out the functional relationships that have been discussed. It was decided that Charlie would develop an agenda item for next time based on this meeting's discussion.

The committee returned its attention to assigning subcommittees to address the existing strategic issues. Point persons were assigned by consensus as follows:

- Budget, Law & Regulation, Capital Funding (Charlie Ng)
- Pedagogical Innovations, Accountability, and Learning Outcomes (Cheryl Marshall)
- Educational Attainment in Relation to Economic Opportunity (Keith Wurtz)
- Competition for Students (Matthew Isaac (Evgeniya Lindstrom))
- Private Support for Education, Including Grant Opportunities (Matthew Isaac)
- Technology Issues and Trends Related to Education (Glen Kuck)
- Financial Aid (Bret Scaliter)

The charge for these subcommittees is to review the current information contained in the Strategic Highlights and Implications, identify anything needs to be revised, and provide suggested revisions. Timelines for subcommittee reporting will be laid out at the next meeting.

Homework

Charlie will work on developing the primer for next meeting's discussion. Also, the subcommittees that were established at the 9/24/10 meeting (Research and Integration of KVCR & PDC) will be giving their first report to the DSPC.

Adjournment

As the meeting adjourned, Charlie thanked Matthew Lee for his service and expertise and mentioned that it is his last official meeting with the District.

The next meeting will be October 22, 2010 at 10 a.m. in ATTC 120.

Kelly Goodrich, Recorder