Workgroup #2 - Planning
Notes from meeting on Sept 10 2012

Attendees: Arielle Aiken, Carl Jew, Fred Chavaria, Jill Kersey, Kitty Moriwaki, Kristin Charles, Lindy McKnight, Pam Mery, Simon Hanson, Tim Ryan, Betty Inclan

1. Review of Items for Board Meeting on September 11

Board has received the annual timeline (dated 8/31/12) and will be reviewing it at its meeting tomorrow night. One new addition, budget preparation, highlights increased coordination between the budget and unit-level planning (including enrollment management).

The question of how prioritized program review items will be consolidated was raised. This occurs in February-April when the draft Annual Plan is assembled, along with the Tentative Budget. Discussion ensued regarding integration of top down (board mission statement) priorities with bottom up information (program reviews). Tim gave good example of tech plan including computer replacements as central to tech plan but priorities being established from bottom up data as to where the computers are placed into operation. It was noted that all units are not equal in their needs and complexity, and that missing is the complexity of unit needs with global guidance from the planning process.

The workgroup discussed Ari’s email questions on the appropriate place for student input in this process. This communication primarily falls under the initial step where the Chancellor leads discussions on performance indicators and assessments with the “College community”. Ari’s questions underscored the need to close the loop on communication with the entire college community and constituent groups including students.

It was generally agreed that the timeline is in good form to represent progress for the Oct 15 accreditation report. No such timeline was in place last year, so this is a substantial improvement. Feedback on the entire planning process will be addressed by the “super advisory council” (name TBD) which will look back on the planning process and review how well it’s working.

The workgroup also reviewed other items on the board agenda with the expectation that planning will be presented later on the evening’s board agenda, so lengthy discussion of data is unlikely. Data includes new state policies, student demographic data, student achievement data, and productivity data. Concerns were voiced as to the limited physical space in which the board will be meeting.

2. Discuss Process and Timeline for Developing an Education Master Plan

The need for both a timely and useful educational master plan was discussed. It was noted that this needs to be a functional document not just done to meet a timeline. The current proposed timeline was to have plan in place by 2014. It was noted that all other colleges use consultants to develop this plan. Group was vocal in its support of bringing in outside help to develop a truly functional plan and that this approach should clearly be outlined in the accreditation response in order to show serious progress on this issue. Honesty and transparency of our shortcomings should be acknowledged in our process. Betty reinforced the goals of analysis, evaluation and improvement over product completion. (No need to have a plan for the sake of having a plan).

3. Date and activities for Next Meeting

To be decided following the September 11 board meeting.