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

Minutes
December 11, 2009

PRESENT

Scott Rippy, Academic Senate, CHC
Dr. Troy Sheffield, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, SBVC
Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chair, Educational Master Plan Committee, CHC
Dr. Glen Kuck, Executive Director, DETS, District
Bruce Baron, Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Services, District
Renee Brunelle, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District
Larry Ciecalone, President, KVCR
Gloria Harrison, President, CHC
Laura Gowen, Classified Senate, SBVC
Jackie Ford-Wingler, Classified Senate, CHC (alternate)
DyAnn Walter, Classified Staff, District
Dr. Marshall Gartenlaub, EDCT (representing Dr. Matthew Isaac)
Damaris Castillo-Torres - Student, SBVC
Dr. Noelia Vela, Chancellor, District
Dr. Matthew Lee, Consultant

Welcome and Introductions

Matthew welcomed everyone and Damaris introduced herself.

Minutes – November 20, 2009

The November 20, 2009 minutes were approved by consensus.

Process and Content

Matthew distributed a tabular timeline (3E) and a graphic timeline (3F) of the work ahead, as the committee had requested. Each task was listed along with a target completion date. Matthew noted that the date for some items might change a bit, but that sticking to the schedule of tasks will help ensure that the committee's work will be done on time. The revised planning process outline and the contents of the District Strategic Plan for Phase I are detailed in handouts 3A and 3B. Matthew's initial cut on what the committee might want to do in Phase II to build on Phase I is detailed in handouts 3C and 3D. Matthew trimmed and rearranged the list of tasks in response to the committee's concerns. He said that the new timeline was ambitious but attainable, though it will require everyone's continued efforts to ensure that the Plan is finished in time.

Matthew pointed out that the original estimated time commitment for DSPC members was 10-12 hours per month, including the time spent in preparation and at subcommittee meetings. Devoting this time and effort is crucial to the success of the project.

Matthew said one of his roles is drafting most portions of the Plan, which will start as early as next week and is intended to facilitate the committee's progress. Successive drafts will reflect the discussion in this group as we move forward. The committee's responsibility as College and District representatives is reviewing and revising the drafts, which comprises an important, ongoing feedback loop. In addition, the schedule of Phase I calls for two large-scale feedback cycles during which we will solicit feedback from the constituencies at the Colleges, from the District Assembly, and from the Board of Trustees.

The first feedback loop will cover the strategic directions and goals. These strategic directions and goals will be built on the college plans. The second feedback loop will cover a nearly complete document with supporting materials in late April and early May. Matthew stated that the final deadline for completion of the DSP is mid-August, but if all goes as planned, the meat of the DSP will be done by early May, with some editing and tweaking possible over the summer. Matthew said that major committee work during summers is often hard because faculty members and students are often gone, and other staff are not always available because of vacations and other plans. He suggested that the committee delegate authority to an editing subcommittee to tweak the Plan over the summer and bring the revisions back to the entire committee for final review at an August 18 meeting. Matthew is confident that if everyone pitches in, we will be able to get everything completed. There were no further questions about the revised timeline, so Matthew said it would be the schedule we will try to stick to over the next several months.

Strategic Issues and Tentative Subcommittee Lineup

Matthew thanked everyone for submitting their interests for subcommittees. He identified subcommittees based primarily on everyone's interest (3G). We are under the gun in Phase I and won't have as much time to do research such as community needs surveys as we will in Phase II. Everybody is on a subcommittee in which they expressed an interest. Matthew "drafted" those who didn't express an interest in any particular issue. Matthew provided the rationale for the subcommittee assignments and talked a little about the nature of the assignments. Bruce and Renee have the first reporting deadline, which is January 15, 2010. Handout 3H is the template for the reports. The task is to gather, review, and discuss the information on the assigned topic. The focus needs to be on any major changes or developments expected over the next few years that will have a potentially significant effect on the District, the Colleges, and/or the students. The subcommittees might find that nothing in their area will have such an effect. This is not a deep study of the issues, but an identification of the most important highlights and their implications. The subcommittees want to focus on the "big gorillas in the room" — those things that obviously have significant implications. Matthew asked the subcommittees to be concise. This is not a dissertation. These reports will be coming back to the committee as a whole to review and ask clarifying questions. Matthew expects that the committee will do more in-depth study in Phase II. The committee will be able to gather more information then and it will have this phase under its belt. Matthew encouraged the group not to underestimate their own knowledge of the

field. He encouraged them to ask colleagues for their input. He said he hopes the committee members have already talked about many of these issues in the past.

HOMEWORK

Initiate subcommittee work. Matthew said he does not want all the reports to be given at one time because the committee won't have enough time for questions and discussion of the issues. **If anyone wants to change a deadline date, let Matthew know by Friday, December 18.**

Review of College Strategic Directions/Initiatives and Goals

Matthew said Phase I work will be based largely on the Board Imperatives and on the strategic directions, goals, and objectives in each college's plan. The Accrediting Commission's requirement is for the DSP to be aligned with the colleges' plans. The DSP, once completed, will guide planning at the colleges. In light of all the information we will be gathering and discussing, the group needs to identify any gaps that the colleges have not yet considered. As we think at this level, we have the broadest strategic perspective of any group in the district. Matthew's intent is to present an initial draft of the strategic directions and goals next week as a starting point for discussion. The committee may find, based on its examination of the issues, that something might be missing, or it might conclude that there is not be a whole lot to add, if anything. Matthew asked if anyone had any questions. Troy asked for clarification about how the pieces from Phase I relate and fit into Phase II. Matthew referred to handouts 3C and 3D, which contain his ideas on the integration of the two phases, and noted that the committee's approach to Phase II will become clearer as Phase I nears completion.

Matthew noted that SBVC's Educational Master Plan has been formally approved by the campus. CHC's Educational Master Plan is still under development so it has not been approved by the campus, though feedback received so far has been supportive. Matthew asked if anyone had clarifying questions about the colleges' strategic directions and initiatives. Jackie asked where CHC is going with the Community Value strategic direction. Matthew explained CHC is still developing objectives, but the idea is that we want to be sure that we are valued by the community and that the community understands what we offer. We need to find out how the community perceives us.

Matthew reiterated that Phase I focuses mostly on alignment with the colleges' plans rather than on the other district entities such as KVCR and EDCT. In Phase 2 the committee will be looking at where the other services fit into the DSP.

Breakout: Implications of CCC Strategic Plan and ARCC Data for DSP

The three breakout groups discussed the strategic plan and the ARCC data and what the implications of these documents have for our work in this committee. Matthew asked each group to record major implications.

Group A – (Scott/Laura/Damaris/Troy)

1.   State: College Awareness & Access
           District goal on access—marketing; outreach; awareness

District – II?
SBVC – access
CHC – access

2. State: Student Success and Readiness
District—innovation, best practices
District—II?
SBVC - Student Success
CHC – III Best Practices
ARCC – Refocus into persistence

3. State: Partnerships and Workforce Development
PDC?
Career Pathways
Models from other states
District – X
SBVC – Partnerships
CHC – Community value

4. State: System Effectiveness
Evaluation of our processes, systematic, analyzed and reported
(transparent)

5. State: Resource Development
Budget
Funding
Policy review
Equity in funding
District – III
SBVC – Technology, I.E.
CHC –VIII Resource development
District allocation model directed at student learning

Comments (Troy)

Group A looked at the 3 strategic plans and where we are in alignment. We need a
definition from the district of access. This subgroup felt that pieces that might be missing
are marketing, outreach and access. What are we doing related to student learning?
We are looking for more opportunities from the district for more innovation. We are
looking at student success in ARCC. ARCC measures persistence and we focus on
retention. Perhaps this can be tweaked. There are some states that are ahead of us in
career pathways so we need to look at other models. We need from our system an
evaluation of process and analyzed data regularly. It is important that we look at the
district allocation model in alignment with student learning.

Group B (Renee/Marshall/Gloria/Cheryl/Larry)

Trends and Implications

1. Differences between campus demographics
Ethnicity

Age

Income/SES

Consider difference in service area populations and/or programs

Urban vs. semi-rural

Types of programs

Need additional environmental scan data

2.   Look at partnering and integration on workforce development issues/programs

3.   Integration and coordination of early college awareness

4.   Integrate professional development activities

5.   Integrated/coordinated outreach to growing/diverse populations
Look at populations growing in each service area

5.   Multiple delivery methods

Cost effective

Student Learning

6.   Resource sharing

7.   Role of District Office in supporting campus needs

8.   Describe our fit into the region

Group B saw differences in the ARCC data relating to ethnicity, age, income. Each campus has different programs which may be coordinated or pulled together. Professional development activities could be integrated and coordinated across the district. Maybe we can share and be more consistent with professional development activities. How do we reach out to the service area populations? What are the differences and how can we share resources? Where does it make sense to share? Look at how we fit into the region.

Group C (Glen/DyAnn/Jackie/Bruce/Noelia)

CHC

1.   Strong need to improve student success

2.   Need to improve basic skills and at-risk students

3.   Below average students who completes 30 units

SBVC

1.   Drop rate above average

2.   Low CAHSEE pass rate

3.   Low college-going rate

4.   Below peer group average of completion credit basic skills course

5.   Below average students who complete 30 units

6.   Below average peer group average student progress and achievement

1.   Need to align missions of 3 higher education systems

<u>SBCCD Strategy</u>

2.   Promote awareness of college as an option

3.   Work with K-12 to prepare for college level work

4.   Promote partnerships between colleges and businesses, emerging labor markets

5.   Promote efficient and effective systems and communicate District-wide

6.   Promote opportunities for resource development

7.   Increase articulation agreements between CSU, UC, private, HS

Group C looked at the ARCC report to compare our colleges to the state-wide average peer group numbers. At CHC, there is a need to improve student success. We need to do more work in improving basic skills and improve those students who complete 30 units. At Valley, we have a high high school drop-out rate, and we need to look at remediation. We need to do better with college plans and integrate more with K-12 to better prepare students for college-level work. All of the public education systems need to talk and align missions and integrate some things.   We need to prepare at early ages to have colleges integrate with K-12.   We want to promote efficient district-wide operations and communications systems and promote opportunities for resource development since we cannot rely on the state as we have in the past. We need to look at increasing our articulation agreements to be sure we are keeping up with articulation and course equivalents.

HOMEWORK

1. **Review foundational documents.**
2. **Review ACCJC Planning Rubric.**
3. **Review initial environmental scan results.**
4. **Review indicators: Enrollment management.**
5. **Review draft working set of Strategic Directions and Goals (to be distributed).**
6. **Initiate subcommittee work (e.g., holding first meeting).**
7. **Let Matthew know if your subcommittee anticipates any problems meeting deadlines.**

Matthew will be emailing one or two more items to the committee before the December 18, 2009 meeting.

Jackie Buus
Recording Secretary