

Planning Committee Meeting March 1, 2021, 3:00 - 5:00 pm Via Zoom MINUTES

Members Present: Pamela Mery (Chair), Susan Boeckmann, Craig Kleinman, Alexis A Litzky, Wendy L.

Miller, Alex Ngo, Judy Seto, David Yee;
Alternates Present: Kit Dai, Cherisa Yarkin
Guests Present: Tom Boegel, Harry Bernstein

Members Absent: Jolene Huey, Hanna May Legisniana

No.	Item	Discussion/Outcome	Follow Up
1.	Welcome and Introductions	Following welcome and introductions, the committee received public comment regarding lifelong learning and facilities.	
2.	Review draft of February 1 st minutes	Deferred to next meeting.	
3.	Updates since last meeting	Tom Boegel, Vice Chancellor of Academic and Institutional Affairs, provided an update on behalf of the workgroup for the Bayview/Hunters Point (BHP) plan.	
		 The workgroup will determine nomenclature that avoids the words "Education Master Plan"—in that order—to prevent confusion with the district's overarching EMP. The BHP plan will have a two-to-three-year horizon. There is a balancing act when considering the extent to which a Center serves the immediate surrounding area versus serving as a specialized location. To date Evans is more in the latter category. A committee member noted that BHP falls within Qualified Opportunity Zones. Another member asked about synergistic balancing of credit and noncredit offerings, referencing curriculum-related conversations with the Automotive chair. A guest asked about how to receive further information and updates. VC Boegel will return next meeting with another update. The Chair provided an update on Annual Planning. 	VC Boegel will return on April 5 to provide another BHP update.

- Completed reports were received from student affairs areas (22 total), along with instructional departments, academic service areas, and selected administrative units within academic affairs (66 total). Responses are being parsed and circulated to inform decision-making.
- In general, reports are submitted by Department Chairs, with Deans receiving, reading, reviewing, and "approving" the reports. While approval does not denote full agreement or prioritization, it constitutes a critical communications path.
- The Chair reminded the committee of the two additional questions used during the "Fall 2020" cycle.
 Q: Progress: "What are you discovering about instruction and/or services in this remote environment that you would want to maintain post-pandemic?"
 Q: Planning: "What kinds of issues are exacerbated or emerging that are likely to remain (unless addressed)?" While follow up was needed in some cases, responses are now complete [one department had been pending at the time of the meeting].
 - The committee discussed who should receive and review those responses. It was agreed that multiple parties are interested including the Planning Committee itself and the Program Review Committee (PRC). Responses are public, so there is no need to limit their availability.
 - A synthesis may be useful as well, perhaps with some major groupings such as Student Affairs and departments relevant for the Adult Education Program (AEP) serving Noncredit.
 - The committee discussed the potential usefulness for HEERF but the timeline may be too tight.
 HEERF themes have consistently centered on technology (for students and employees) and additional support.
- Resource requests are being routed to Fan 5, as well as Technology and Facilities Committees for consideration. Requests will also be considered within instructional lottery funds where permissible. [To be confirmed... classified requests are considered by Cabinet and the Vacancy Review Group.]
- Responses to Curriculum and Assessment Currency will also be reviewed with an eye toward improving the reports provided to departments and potentially improving the guidance given to departments, if warranted, prior to the upcoming comprehensive program review cycle in Fall 2021.

4.	Annual Planning & Budgeting Calendar	 Discussion of the Annual Planning & Budgeting Calendar Working Draft was limited due to time. Three members (Alexis Litzky, Wendy Miller, David Yee) volunteered to work with the Chair on fleshing out the draft. A committee member noted that prior versions emphasized who is responsible for each activity. The Committee also discussed whether we might have input on the Budget Assumptions. The Chair noted a desire for realistic scenarios. Committee members expressed concern about previously full classes being eliminated for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 and the question of impacts on overall enrollment. 	The Chair will schedule group time focused on the calendar.
5.	ACCJC Annual Report and Goal- setting	Based on information from last year's report, current figures, and a presentation from Research on equity and opportunity gaps, followed by robust discussion. • Actual course completion declined slightly during the pandemic. Fall 2020 credit course completion was 71% versus prior Fall terms at 72%. The committee was in agreement that no adjustments be recommended for the institution-set standard of 70% (floor) and the stretch goal of 73% (aspirational). Instead, the College should focus on eliminating equity/opportunity gaps in course completion and other metrics. • The number of students earning certificates of achievement (i.e., credit certificates) in 2019-2020 far surpassed the College's stretch goal (1,268 vs 818). However, the committee was in agreement that any changes to the stretch goal and/or institution-set standards would need to be based on a fuller understanding of pending section reductions due to decreased Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF), as well as an understanding of the sustainability of the Completion Campaign work going forward. • Similarly, the number of students earning associate degrees (including ADTs) has been nearly identical to the College's stretch goal of 1,331 for the last two years. As with certificates the committee was in agreement to delay any specific recommendations for changes to the stretch goal and/or institution-set standard. • Updated transfer figures were not yet available at the time of the meeting. • Programmatic standards and goals for Licensure and Job Placement are following the typical procedure of being discussed in general by the CTE Steering Committee and adjusted when warranted based on input from program leads (typically Department Chairs) in consultation with the respective Academic Dean. Those areas that fall below their previously set institution-set standard address the following prompt in the Annual Plan process: "Briefly describe the most likely cause(s) of the lower rates, then indicate what	Research will return with Transfer numbers when those become available.

		action(s) your department is taking to improve the rates and meet the Institution-Set Standard."	
6.	Communications Check-in (Standing Agenda Item)	 Cherisa Yarkin, Director of Planning, provided on information on the Technology Plan update underway. The Tech Plan Workgroup, under the Technology Committee, has been meeting regularly. Cherisa regularly attends and the new CTO has started attending as well. The process for soliciting input about technology-enabled services is under discussion and taking shape. The scope of the plan will be approximately 3 years. The Workgroup has been actively engaged in establishing a balance between strategic and operational focus. While the Tech Plan is a collegewide plan, the ITS department necessarily plays a critical role in its development and implementation. 	The Chair will invite the College's new CTO to a future Planning Committee meeting.
7.	Future Agenda Topics (Standing Agenda Item)	Deferred to next meeting.	

Key Planning Committee Reference Documents: <u>Description and Purpose</u> and <u>Objectives for 2020-2021</u> Upcoming Meetings: First Mondays 2020-2021; Next meeting is April 5.