

Institutional Strategic Planning Council Workday
October 30, 2019
CSS-217 (12:00-5:00pm)
Minutes

Members Present: Kris Anderson, Greg Aycock, Quinton Bemiller, Celia Brockenbrough Monica Esparza, Monica Green (Administrative Co-Chair), Ruth Leal (Staff Co-Chair), Sam Lee, Virgil Lee, Mark Lewis, Arezoo Marashi, David Mills, Barbara Moore, Chris Poole, Kaneesha Tarrant

Members Absent: Melissa Bader (Faculty Co-Chair), Michael Collins, Leona Crawford, Bryan Medina (ASNC Rep.)

12:00-12:30pm	Lunch
12:30-1:00pm	Team Building Activity
1:00-1:30pm	Committee/Council Purpose Match
1:30-2:00pm	Link Goals/Objectives
2:00-2:15pm	Gallery Walk
2:15-2:30pm	Break
2:30-3:30pm	Activity Debrief Discussion

Members reviewed the [District Strategic Plan](#) developed and approved at DSPC. RCC and MVC are aligning their plans with the district. There is an expectation of college participation at the district level so it is prudent to review our committee structure to review how we fit within the district's structure.

District SP Council	Norco College SP Council	Notes
Equity	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Student Services Planning Council	Student Access and Success/Guided Pathways Guided Pathways Workgroup – not currently attached to any council. What would it look like if it was? Which council? Student Transformation
Institutional Effectiveness and Planning	Program and Assessment	
Resources		

Advancement Partnership & Communications		
--	--	--

Discussion Points:

- Within our existing college structure, we already have good representation with the exception of the TBD sections in the district chart. It may be too premature to try and determine the alignment. It is important to note going forward that the colleges are held accountable to the work of the district committees. We are in this evolution along with the district, there are whole areas that need to be developed, and they are building that infrastructure as we are.

The committee continued to discuss the college's governance structure.

Discussion Points:

- There are too many objectives assigned to BFPC from the committee alignment activity. Using Stokoe as an example, there are roles for academic affairs for program/resources development however we do not currently have a council to do the foundational work. Academic programming needs be developed strategically. Curriculum committee has a process for program/curriculum development. Suggested AAPC, APC is a senate committee, and develop an AAPC for Academic Program Development.
- What is the purpose of our committees and councils? Is it that we are building a structure to achieve our EMP? Should we be working the other way around, building councils to meet the needs of our three goals and adding committees where there are gaps?
- To see the evolution of the college, we get things done. Whether we articulate how we do that well, we are still transforming the institution.
- Academic Senate has too many committees reporting to this body and it leaves less time for important senate business. How do we put this together in a way that makes sense? The work is done at the committee level; councils are the decision making bodies.
- Succession planning is important, committee/council members need training, and mentoring as they are assigned to new committee/council service. No one should leave their post without having someone to take it on.
- Leadership councils, in theory seem like a good idea however there is a lot of overlap. As an organizing principle it sounds good, but actually working out would be difficult. Suggestion given to do the realignment exercise without the councils factored in as the work is done at the committee level.
- This discussion is revealing what we do not have. The degree to which CTE is here and not here, and program development
- Suggestion to do this activity with other groups.
- Keep in mind that whatever is created must be user friendly for all constituent groups.
- We are good at the work but we need that top level. Councils are overburdened, it is better to define where the work needs to be done. We have some outliers in the committees and some have outlived their existence or a reason to be.

The committee reviewed and discussed RCC's governance structure.

Discussion Points:

- RCC Senate has two standing committees – Curriculum and Academic Standards
- All committees are associated with leadership councils (4) where the decisions are made. Faculty leads on leadership councils report to the senate on matters related to 10+1.

3:30-4:30pm [Strategic Planning Cycle](#)

The council reviewed the sections of the strategic planning cycle in the 2012-2018. Members were asked to evaluate if it is working, needs to be revised, or eliminated. Are our current systems supporting our planning?

Discussion Points:

- Ideas originate from program reviews guided by academic standards and educational master plan. Strategic goals, objectives with measurable outcomes, strategies (action plans), assign responsibilities (oversight of goals and objectives), resource linkage (ensure sustainability and success), evaluate cycle, outcome reports, review and refine (evaluate council/committees annually). This evaluation process helped the councils to make needed changes.
- When we first did the goals from the last SP we are at an inflection point. If we restructure the committee to make their existence about the goals then it may help the committees engage with the data and be able to make the link.
- Referring to the planning cycle, we have the strategic goals, who does step 1-3? In this example, the EMP was from 2008, the institution had changed, and the SP prior to 2013 was based on the EMP with revisions. Now, we are building the EMP and SP at the same time.
- Program review has driven resource allocation but what about program development? Program review could do this. Use program reviews to inform the development of a new EMP. Should formalize the program review process in our strategic plan and governance document.
- Assessment informs program review. We create the processes and then we need to educate the faculty on how to use the data.
- Program review varies by discipline so be sure to keep flexibility in the process, being general allows for flexibility.
- We need to refine the program review process before putting it verbatim into the SP. Make sure this is an actual annual ongoing cycle.

4:30-5:00pm Evaluation/Close