

**Minutes of the Planning and Budgeting Council**  
**Rosenberg 518**  
**September 3, 2008**

**Present:** Carlota del Portillo, Attila J. Gabor, Peter Goldstein, Don Q. Griffin (Chair), Marc Kitchel, Susan Lopez, Madeline Mueller, Alice Murillo, Stephanie Nuttman, Dennis Piontkowski, Athena Lynn Steff, Fred Teti.

**Resource:** John Bilmont, Bob Gabriner, Hal Huntsman,

**1. Review of Draft PBC Minutes**

The minutes of 5/23/08 were approved as corrected. The minutes of 8/25/08 were approved as reported.

**2. Mission and Vision Statements**

Vice Chancellor Gabriner reported that the College is reviewing its Mission and Vision Statements in preparation for a new Strategic Plan to be developed in Spring and Fall 2009. He provided members with a written proposal for the process, including rationale, participants to be involved, methodology, timeline and process. He took some feedback on the timeline (see below).

The Mission and Vision Statements form the basis for the Strategic Plan. The entire College community will have an opportunity for input into those foundational documents. Electronic methods will be used to contact most employees, but some will have to be reached in other ways. Students will also be involved in the review process. A survey is being developed through the Offices of Research and Planning. Survey questions will be circulated via email in preparation for discussion at the October PBC meeting. There was discussion of how the survey might be set up for ease of understanding. Council members asked that there be explanatory information included to inform respondents regarding the Mission and Vision Statements, the difference between them, and other pertinent context. It was noted that modifications to the Mission Statement will be somewhat constrained by the need for brevity and by the multiple missions of the College, which come from the community college functions throughout the state. This is not as much the case with the Vision Statement, which is longer.

The survey will be kept open-ended so that respondents can respond in various ways. In October and November, the PBC will review the survey data and discuss the implications for changing or maintaining the statements. Revisions and modifications will then be drafted as needed. The final review will involve the PBC and College Advisory Council. Bob agreed to move the Board vote to January and adjust the rest of the timeline accordingly. He also agreed that the Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Administrators' Association will participate in the final review. Like many College planning documents, the Mission and Vision Statements will be considered living documents that are subject to periodic and as-needed review.

**2. Program Review**

Vice Chancellor Gabriner reported that constituencies are still considering the draft Program Review documents that are circulating. There is some need to further strengthen the linkage between Program Review and resource allocations. Bob also stated a need to revive the Program Review Committee but this time, making sure the all the vice chancellors participate, so that the group has high-level visibility and impact. The goal is to have all units complete program review within the space of a year, once the process is initiated. It is particularly important to get the process going by March 2009, when the Midterm Response is prepared for WASC. There will be various challenges; e.g., some units which are unaccustomed to doing a program review may need additional explanation and support. The Chancellor suggested the process may start with some of the administrative units. He said any long delay in getting started would be a mistake.

There will be both an annual review and a six-year review. Bob explained that the annual Program Review process will be similar to the process followed in the Budget Review and Recommendations Process that took place a couple of years ago. The comprehensive six-year process is changing. It will now focus primarily on the review of courses and programs. In addition, student success and progress will also be another major focus of that process. Discussion then followed regarding student learning outcomes and their status at the College. The rationale for including SLOs at the six-year Program Review level was that it is the most feasible way to do it at this time given the controversy among CCSF faculty regarding SLOs. Bob informed the Council that CCSF has 90% of the SLOs that are needed at course level, but lesser percentages at program and collegewide levels.

The next step in restarting Program Review will be to form the Program Review Committee. That committee will decide the timeline for implementing the process. Some of the preliminaries need to be completed this semester so that by Spring, some departments will be doing their annual Program Review. Chancellor Griffin expressed that the key to increasing the institutional value of the process will be getting the involvement of the vice chancellors along with faculty, staff and students in the reconstituted committee. Their involvement will also help to ensure better integration with budgeting.

### **3. CCSF Strategic Plan**

The current CCSF Strategic Plan is dated 2003-2009; a new plan is needed. The strategic planning process will start in spring and conclude at the end of fall 2009. The intent is to make it an iterative and inclusive process, as it was the last time. There was general agreement at that time that the process had been satisfactory, so the College will probably continue the established process. The evaluation of the 2003-2009 Strategic Plan will be started shortly and needs to be done no later than February, so that we can have that information available when drafting a new plan.

### **4. Follow-up on College Performance Indicators--Supplemental Measures**

The 2008 College Performance Indicators Report (2006-07 data) is about to be released by the Office of Research. Discussion continued on proposed modifications to the CPI. At the last meeting, it was agreed that transfers, degrees, and certificates by ethnicity could become an indicator in next year's report. (This year, it would remain in the appendix.) The participation rate this year showed new information by ethnicity and also by age and gender. The participation rate shows the percentage of each population of San Francisco residents who enroll at CCSF in a given year. It is intended to focus especially on the use of the College by residents of the City. That data was discussed at the last meeting and found to be in need of reworking. Several changes were subsequently made, including the addition of an "other" column in the gender and ethnicity sections. The Council found the improved format of the data easier to follow. That information will go into appendix of this year's CPI and was approved to continue there as supplemental information in next year's version. However, Vice Chancellor Murillo requested that City of San Francisco percentages by ethnicity also be included this year. Madeline Mueller had made a similar request previously. It was felt that it might be confusing to have two very different types of percentages on the same page. Therefore, the ethnicity percentages for San Francisco residents will be added to the workforce diversity page where there are already similar percentages relating to employees and students.

### **5. Future Meetings**

The agenda contained information on the remaining PBC meetings for Fall in R518. The October 7 meeting has been changed to October 14 from 3:00-5:00. Other meetings will be November 3 from 3:00-5:00 and December 15 from 2:00-4:00.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan Lopez