

Institutional Strategic Planning Council (ISPC)

April 1, 2015

1:00-3:00 (ST 107)

Attendees:

- **Attendees:**

Ruth Leal (Staff-Instructional Production Specialist*ISPC Chair*)

Melissa Bader (Faculty Rep to District EMTF *ISPC Chair*)

Diane Dieckmeyer (VP Academic Affairs*ISPC Chair*)

Carol Farrar, (Dean of Instruction)

Vanessa Acosta (Staff-Admissions and Records)

Beth Gomez (VP Business Services)

Barbara Moore (Transfer Faculty)

Natalie Aceves (Staff-Educational Advisor)

Peggy Campo (Academic Senate President)

David Mills (Basic Skills Faculty)

Jason Parks (Chair of Chairs – APC)

Diann Thursby (Staff-Grants Administrative Specialist)

Greg Aycock (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness)

Jim Thomas (CTE Faculty)

Emile Bradshaw (Tutorial Services Technician)

Celia Brockenbrough (Library Faculty)

Deborah Tompsett-Makin (At-Large)

Ruth Jones-Santos (Staff-Administrative Assistant II)

Mark DeAsis (Dean of Admissions and Records)

Damon Nance (Dean, Technology and Learning Resources)

Koji Uesugi (Dean, Student Services)

Laurie Hankins (Recorder)

- **Absentees:**

Ana Molina (Staff-Administrative Assistant II)

Monica Green (VP Student Services)

John Coverdale (CTE & Grants Advisory Rep)

Benjamin Vargas (ASNC-President)

Andres Elizalde, Associate Professor, English

- **Guests:** Arend Flick, Paul Parnell, Gustavo Ocegura

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of Minutes for March 18, 2015.

Motion by Jim Thomas, second by Deborah Makin to approve the minutes from the March 18, 2015 meeting. Motion approved with one abstention.

I. Action Items:

A. Institutional Set Standards (ISS) – 2nd Reading – (Greg Aycock)

Reviewed the Senate Recommendation regarding Institutional Set Standards Response. Discussion:

- Where does this information go? Where will it live? This document will “live” with the Strategic Planning Committee.
- How can we link it to the Academic Senate? ISPC has already set this up with the Academic Senate President.

Motion by Jason Parks, second by Deborah Makin to accept the Institutional Set Standards (ISS). Motion approved.

II. Information Items:

A. Equity Discussion – (Gustavo Ocegueda)

Handout provided and reviewed by committee followed by discussion.

- Equity Report revealed that males appear to be disproportionately impacted in all areas.
- Control group is the highest performing group as defined by the state.
- Groups totaling less than 20% of the population are not reflected. Refer to online graph. Consider adding more information to the existing chart. Need more information on groups that are not listed. Melissa would like to see ALL disaggregated data.
- Attrition may be the reason that so many areas require intervention.
- DRC students must self-identify. The assumption is that the actual DRC student numbers are much higher than represented but students do not want to disclose.
- Only students that utilize Veterans benefits are reflected. Actual numbers for Veterans group could be higher.
- Comparison is done by region including Norco, Corona and Eastvale

Gaps-questions for feedback

- This plan affects ALL of us. Institutions exist that are miles ahead of us in regards to equity and they were there long before equity money was available. We have lots of work to do. How do we go about getting it done? Should it be a committee of ISPC or should it be a subcommittee of the Academic Senate by appointment?
- The Academic Senate will be discussing equity and needs supportive backing from the institution.
- There is evidence that few people have a clear understanding of student equity.
- The data is academically focused. A subcommittee of the Academic Senate would focus heavily on faculty, but everyone, including faculty, staff and administration needs to be involved.
- Think about an Equity Committee with a stakeholder. Student Equity is now heavily Student Services based with little support from faculty.
- Since Faculty are key to the success of this plan should we consider making it part of Program Review?
- Consider creating a designated roll to coordinate and plan vs committee work. This task is now assigned solely to Gustavo.
- How do we make this not just about Success but also about Equity? Equity training was suggested but will require funding for FT and PT faculty.

- “Equity” is the process of highlighting what is not working.
- Faculty at Saddleback receive a single fact sheet at the beginning of the semester that reflects all the student statistics. This information will only be helpful to our students if the faculty are willing to change their approach to teaching.

Updates:

- Currently working on workshops for summer with equity training on campus
- Flex Day Aug 28 Equity dialog with faculty, staff, and administrators. If you are interested in participating contact Gustavo.

B. Recommendation 1 Follow-up Discussion (Diane Dieckmeyer)

The policy and procedures for regular evaluation of integrated institutional planning, budgeting and decision-making processes (page 29) was reviewed by the committee. Of the eight “evaluation mechanisms” included in the handout, the focus of this discussion was on items that did not receive an “x” (item #5 Survey of the COTW, item #7 Annual Open Dialogue Session and item #8 Annual Evaluation Report).

What does this mean? We will learn from reflecting on our experience. Discussion:

- Who participates in the surveys?
- Are the questions appropriate?
- Is the audience appropriate?
- Has the survey outlived its usefulness? Is it just a smile sheet?
- Are we using the data correctly?
- What was the need at the time for the survey questions?
- How are students reflected? Students do not attend so they are not reflected.
- Does the data reflect the opinions of only those who attend?
- Would the decision making process improve if we attached the data?
- Consider calendaring discussion of the survey results.
- Consider sending the survey out to the entire institution instead of just the COTW.
- Will a wider net reveal more meaningful information?
- This instrument is a useful document and was used by Dr. Parnel with the Accreditation Team to show that we do assessment.
- Consider doing a more comprehensive accreditation survey every two years linked with the accreditation standard. Send to the entire college for response.
- Follow the progress by reading links and attending the COTW meetings. The evaluation procedures page should be noted on the website.
- Consider timing of the survey.

Summary

- Continue to ask questions
- Send survey to the entire college
- Close the loop and do something with the data
- Revise and use a more comprehensive survey.
- Re-write item #5 or leave as is?
- Revise survey
- Evaluate at the end of one year
- Consider what the strategic issues are right now and five years from now. If we change every year there is no way to compare.

Motion by D. Makin/P. Campo to revise this document and resubmit to the committee. Send to the entire institution instead of just the COTW. Results need to come back to the ISPC. Motion approved.

C. Budget Report/Update-(Beth Gomez)

- Update- \$3,000,000 variance for Norco. FTES does not cost the same at Norco compared to RIV & MV. Committee met to review historical costs. Highest grants at Norco. Norco will retain 83%, district 17%. What happens when grants run out? Agreed to historical cost during transition year only. Committee tasked to come up with fair and equitable solutions and submit to District Strategic Planning Counsel.
- Release of the Governor's 2015-16 budget proposal is just the beginning of the state budget process.
- Strong growth in the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee
- Total Restricted Resources for RCCD \$5.4 Million
- New growth formula funded FTES difference 885 vs 664 or \$1.04 million
- State Mandate Block Grant - will it hold?
- Student Success and Student Equity - will it hold?
- Proposition 30 begins to phase out in 2016
- PERS and STRS increases on average of \$1.20 million per year in each of the next 6 years.
- January - Governor's budget proposal.
- May - Governor releases revised budget
- June - RCCD receives tentative budget
- September Adoption of RCCD 2015-2016 budget

D. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Goals and Indicator Report -- (Greg Aycock)

Discussion tabled until next meeting.

III. Open Hearing

- ISPC Enrollment Management Meeting scheduled for Monday, April 6
- Issue with recycling. Items identified as recycling are being picked up and thrown into the regular trash.

Adjourned – 3:02pm

Senate Recommendation Regarding Institutional Set Standards-Procedural Response

Dean of Institutional Effectiveness identifies a “dip” below ISS, as measured by ½ standard deviation from the 5-year norm.

- Shares information with appropriate VP
- VP communicates with ISPC co-chairs
- Co-chairs will identify appropriate constituency to investigate; commit to a new task-force
 - Identify possible causes
 - Generate a plan of action/response-entities to be involved in the action
 - Ensure an assessment plan is in place before the action is applied
 - Consistent reporting out on progress to ISPC
 - Summative report to ISPC

Elements that might be considered:

- Review of core commitments to see if any areas related to the “dip” can be enhanced
- Internal variables, e.g. FTE allocation, faculty retirement, lack of resources
- ISS levels/benchmarks, are they still reasonable/valid
- Identification and examination of existing approaches to teaching and learning, consider if revision/updating is needed
- Institutional data to guide analysis, inform discussion and identify potential gaps or impact; ensure relevance of available data or identify and request additional data
- Assess the impact of external variables on the college
- Experiences of sister colleges in District and other colleges in the region

Strategic Planning Retreat

Reflecting on Recommendation 1

December 3, 2014

Recommendation 1

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College consistently evaluate all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle; develop a standard assessment instrument for all participatory governance committees; **develop a process to assess the evaluation mechanisms used in integrated planning and resource allocation to ensure that those evaluations are effective in improving programs, processes, and decision-making structures**; and develop strategies to broadly communicate the results of these evaluations to the entire College community. (Standards I.B.6; I.B.7; IV.A.5)

Do what?

- Develop a process
- To assess the evaluation mechanisms
- To assure they are effective
- In improving programs, processes, decision-making structures

Eight “evaluation mechanisms”

- ✓ Annual Survey of Effectiveness of the Planning Councils
- ✓ Annual Survey of Effectiveness of Academic Senate and Senate Standing Committees
- ✓ Memorandum from College President
- ✓ Annual Progress Report on Educational Master Plan Goals, Objectives and “Dashboard Indicators”
- ✓ Survey of Committee of the Whole Membership
- ✓ Report of Resource Allocation
- ✓ Annual Open Dialogue Session
- ✓ Annual Evaluation Report

Our Framework

John Dewey ...

“We do not learn from our experience, we learn from reflecting on experience.”

John Dewey



Reflection

- Meaning-making
- Systematic, rigorous thinking
- In community
- Valuing personal and intellectual growth