



District Strategic Planning Committee Minutes May 7, 2010

Present:

Damaris Castillo-Torres, Student, SBVC
Larry Cicalone, President/General Manager, KVCR-TV-FM
Jackie Ford-Wingler, Classified Staff, CHC
Dr. Marshall Gartenlaub, EDCT (representing Dr. Matthew Isaac)
Laura Gowen, Classified Staff, SBVC,
Gloria Harrison, President, CHC
Kaylee Hrisoulas, Student, CHC
Glen Kuck, Executive Director, DETS
Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee
Scott Rippy, Faculty, CHC
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee
DyAnn Walter, Classified Staff, District Office
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

I. Welcome and Introductions

Matthew welcomed everyone.

II. Approval of Minutes – April 23, 2010

There were no corrections to the April 23, 2010 minutes, and they were approved by consensus.

III. Review of and Clarifying Questions on Distributed Documents

A. Draft Objectives, April 18, 2010 (document 13B)

Matthew sent out an update (document 13B), which incorporated suggested changes.

B. Glossary (document 13C)

Matthew sent out an update (document 13C), which incorporated suggested changes.

C. Objectives by Point Persons/Groups (document 13E)

Matthew said document 13E is just a different cut on the objectives sorted by point person. It struck him as useful to point out who has responsibility for multiple objectives. Deb suggested the point person/group under 1.1.2 should be “Chancellor’s Cabinet.” She also suggested that the VPSSs be added under 2.2.1. The committee members concurred with these changes.

IV. **Discussion and Action: Possible Changes to Draft District Strategic Plan, April 25, 2010 (document 13A) Based on Report of Feedback on DSP through May 5, 2010 (document 13D)**

Matthew pointed out a few changes he had made based on the discussion at the last meeting.

- An *implications* header was added in the appropriate places.
- The ARCC information was updated to reflect the 2010 report.
- He added measurement definitions at the bottom of the *Student Performance, WSCH per Faculty Load, and FTES* section.

In document 13D, Matthew listed the feedback by “theme” and noted that how progress on implementation of the Plan would be monitored came up repeatedly. In responses to those questions in the open forums, he did point out that the point persons were there in part to insure progress occurred. He said there was a sense that the annual progress report might not be frequent enough.

There were no changes to the plan based on *Feedback* document 13D No. 12.

Matthew asked if the committee needed to be a little more direct in monitoring and ensuring progress; for example, if progress is not sufficient, then direct action will be taken (No.14). Bruce had suggested having the point people get together quarterly to see how we are doing on these items and to determine if more support is needed. The chancellor could convene the meetings. In the quarterly meeting, the chancellor or DSPC should be explicit about corrective action on objectives where progress has not been sufficient. We might need to do more. The feedback indicates the desire for more teeth in the monitoring. Matthew pointed out, however, that there are no guarantees of progress in any strategic plan. The plan requires buy-in and the participation and active support of the executive leadership.

Matthew asked for comments. Troy suggested taking an example of something both colleges have to do, and asking how monitoring would take place. What is sustainable at both colleges? Regardless of who is there, how will it get done? Gloria said we have an annual report which is submitted to the board and those responses go back to what we have been directed to do by the board. The board reviews that, provides feedback and lets us know what we need to do the following year. Gloria has been telling CHC senior management that everything we do has to tie into how we are meeting our general plan, and that should become a permanent part of committee agendas. Ultimately the board sets the direction of the district and campuses for the following year. The chancellor can meet with us quarterly, but it has to be a cultural change where that plan is the very first item on meeting agendas. Matthew asked if it makes sense that this item be added to the academic, classified and student senate agendas, too, so they are participating in the monitoring and the communicating.

Marshall said we need to add monitoring and mentoring as part of the DSPC’s job. He didn’t think we needed to create another structure; instead, an additional part of the charge of the DSPC would be monitoring and mentoring. Damaris agreed that this group should assume monitoring and mentoring responsibilities. Scott said it should be up to each constituency to invite people from the DSPC to their meetings and report once in a while. Matthew said that leadership in the various groups changes year to year, and added that Gloria’s point is well taken in that there

needs to be a cultural change in all the groups, not just the leadership, to ask the questions and make sure that things are happening.

Troy asked how the person who is semi-involved knows what is actually occurring. How do we engage them? Mandatory meetings where everyone comes are beneficial. Matthew suggested building in communication modes, written and in person, and the expectation that the in-service days will be devoted in part to a status report on planning. The colleges set the agendas for their in-service days. How can we encourage the colleges to use their in-service time to talk about planning? Is that something that can be put into the plan? An additional objective would be to build in communication methods to ensure all district personnel can be well informed about the plans.

After further discussion, the committee agreed on a new Action under 1.1.1: “Build into the agendas of regular meetings and events (e.g., In-service Day, President’s Cabinet, Crafton Council, SBVC College Council, Senates, and meetings of other representative bodies) communication about progress on the DSP.”

Matthew asked if the sense of this group is to have the DSPC take the point in monitoring. Glen said he liked the idea of having structures for communication. He also said we need to make it clear what the committees’ responsibilities are and how they communicate back to their constituency. Matthew pointed out that we have an action on that in 1.1.1. Glen said that would work. Troy said SBVC revisits its mission every year and then we ask how the representatives communicated the mission to their groups. Someone needs to make sure information comes back to the meetings. Matthew said different people absorb information in different ways. There needs to be alternatives besides the minutes. Matthew asked if the committee wanted to add something. DyAnn asked what if they don’t come to the meeting. Matthew said the question is getting the information effectively back to the campuses. Laura used the example that she is sitting on this committee, and if she does not make it to classified senate, a tool that would make sure communications occurred anyway would help. That tool could be shared with the classified senate president, and he could share that with his group. She could then bring the feedback back to this group. Matthew said another action under the same objective could be something like developing a tool to facilitate regular communication on the campuses. Laura said if there is a form or tool, at least the progress can be documented. Troy suggested setting up a website for feedback. Glen said they are experimenting with “Share Point” which is a web-based tool. Damaris thought a web-based tool was a good idea, but noted that if someone misses a meeting, it is up to them to use that tool to report on progress made. She thought members still need to go to the next meeting to ask what had happened, and to get their feedback. Matthew said groups will require training. Jackie asked if this tool is the same tool referred to in the social media discussion. Matthew said it would be different. Matthew suggested adding the action, “Develop a template or other tool to facilitate regular communication with and feedback from all district personnel about DSP progress.” The committee agreed.

Matthew asked if the additional charge of quarterly monitoring should be added to this committee. It sounds like an additional provision in evaluation and revision. The point people need to be getting on board in the fall. Marshall suggested that the main question in monitoring

was whether the committee did what it set out to do, and that the committee did not want to be the police. Matthew responded that this committee is dependent on point people and committees back on the campus, and without them nothing will happen, so there is a shared responsibility. This committee does not want to be police but it does want to solicit information about progress and initiate corrective action if corrective action is needed. Matthew suggested adding the header "Quarterly Monitoring," with the text, "The DSPC will monitor progress on the DSP on a quarterly basis in consultation with the point persons and groups, and facilitate corrective actions as needed." The committee agreed. Matthew asked, with these three additions to address the monitoring and ensuring progress issue, whether we have addressed that issue sufficiently. The DSPC felt comfortable that the issue had been addressed with these changes.

Matthew asked if the committee wanted to take any action on No. 17 (coordination with college committees) beyond the three changes already approved. The committee agreed that the issue was already handled.

In No. 16 (district support of the colleges), the comment was made that the District Office, in the past, would go out and "do stuff" while everyday needs are not being met at the campuses. Matthew said the idea behind the DSP is that if you have an initiative that you want to try, and it is in accord with the plan, all other things being equal, it should get the nod over one that is not in accord with the plan. Ensuring that happens requires administrative commitment. The expectation is that things in accord with the plan move ahead. Marshall saw the comment as showing more of a lack of understanding of the issues or the big picture. Troy said when something is selected, it needs to be demonstrated why that was selected. She said the colleges need to know what is happening from the district. Matthew said the new resource allocation model will help in this area. Glen said he agrees with what is being said but that there is also another layer. There seems to be an assumption that there is "X" amount of money but the district used the money somewhere else. It goes back to communication, and how resources are allocated needs to be communicated well and effectively. Scott said right now the district office has certain assessments in the new allocation model. He asked how those costs got decided on, and were they, for example, based on board imperatives? For the future, is there something we can put in the DSP that says that for any additional costs that the district wants to take on, it has to be in line with the DSP? Matthew said that not *every* new initiative will come under the DSP. Matthew suggested that under objective 3.1.2, something could be added along the lines Scott suggested. Troy said the district needs to institutionalize its own plan. Glen said the program review process, which is new at the district, requires us to justify any new dollars. That is something we have not done before. Scott asked if we can institutionalize a policy whereas the budget committee reviews the budget within the framework of the DSP. The committee agreed that Matthew should add "DSPC makes a formal recommendation to the District Budget Committee to review the annual budget within the framework of the DSP" under 3.1.2. Gloria said when this committee meets quarterly, it will be looking at the various plans to see what progress has been made.

Additional objectives were suggested in No. 7. Matthew said we actually did talk about a district-wide process for grants but it didn't make it into the plan. He asked if we need to add an action or objective. Marshall said grants are just a funding mechanism. Matthew suggested this item go

into the “parking lot” for next year. Troy thought there needs to be a communication about grants between the sites. Glen suggested if we know what people are going after, we can simply form a committee. Matthew asked if we could add an action, “Establish a committee for coordination of and communication about grant activity district-wide” under 3.1.2. The committee agreed. The committee can look at establishing a stand-alone objective next year.

The feedback on No. 24 suggested reversing the timelines in 3.1.1. and 4.2.1. The committee agreed, and Matthew will make the change. 3.1.1 will become “2010-11 and ongoing,” and 4.2.1 will become “Fall 2011.”

Glen’s position will be added in 3.1.1 as a point person.

It was suggested and agreed to remove the words *experiment with* in the 2.1.1 actions. Matthew will make that change.

As suggested in No. 15 (usage and terminology), the committee agreed that Matthew will bring the identified upper case words down to lower case.

The committee agreed that applicable references to PDC will be changed to Economic Development and Corporate Training.

Matthew said he had labeled the rest of the questions on the feedback report as resolved, unless anyone had any further questions. The committee had no questions.

Matthew summarized the changes he will make to the DSP in accord with the discussion today.

V. Organizing for Phase 2

VI. Other Business

Matthew reminded committee members of the celebratory brunch to be served at the May 14 meeting, and encouraged everyone to be there.

VII. Homework

A. Review the final draft of the *DSP*, to be distributed.

VIII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at noon, and Matthew thanked the committee.

Jackie Buus, Recorder