



Approved 4-15-21

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

CITY COLLEGE • MESA COLLEGE • MIRAMAR COLLEGE • COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

District Strategic Planning Committee

March 18, 2021

2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Zoom

Meeting Minutes

Present:

Antonio Alarcón, Natalia Córdoba-Velásquez Alarcón, John Bromma, Bonnie Ann Dowd, Poppy Fitch, Bridget Herrin, Carol Hilliard (scribe), Neill Kovrig, Charlie Lieu, Jessica Luedtke, Laura Murphy, Susan Murray, Daniel Miramontez, Mashahiro Omae, Brennan Pearson, Susan Topham, Gregory Smith, Manual Velez

The meeting began at 2:30 p.m. Antonio Alarcón welcomed the committee, and introductions were made. There were no requests for additional agenda items.

1. Approval of December 10, 2020 Minutes

- a. The December 10, 2020 minutes were reviewed, and a motion to approve the minutes was made by Neill Kovrig, seconded by Bridget Herrin, and carried.

2. Strategic Plan Development, Approval and Implementation Process

- a. The committee reviewed the development, approval, and implementation process, and discussed the history of the process, and provided suggestions:
 - Antonio Alarcón shared this process was previously approved by the Chancellor's Cabinet, as well as the existing Strategic Plan being granted a one-year-extension.
 - Susan Topham stressed the importance of the process sharing and being inclusive of the institution's feedback.
 - Bonnie Dowd recommended this process be examined with simultaneous review by all constituents (committee, institutions, academic senates, and governance groups). Dowd shared the committee is composed of members who represent other Districtwide committees that lend applicable background and knowledge to this group, as well as reporting back out to those committees. Dowd recommended if the committee would like to amend a process, that the group submit a proposal to the Chancellor's Cabinet for review.

- b. Susan Topham shared she would like to ensure the consistency groups has enough time to review and provide input.
- c. Antonio Alarcón recommended moving forward with finalizing this process, and disseminate to all other constituent groups.

Action Item: *Finalize the Strategic Plan Development, Approval and Implementation Process document, and disseminate to constituent groups.*

3. District Strategic Plan Development Timeline FY2023-FY2026

- a. The committee reviewed and discussed the details of the draft timeline:
 - Antonio Alarcón recommended each workgroup will focus on a chosen theme which will serve as the informational development in a new Strategic Plan. Workgroups can be formed through volunteering, and support can be provided by Educational Services as needed.
 - Dowd inquired why the student-centered funding formula was a part of the committee's review.
 - Topham recommended the committee focus on key indicators, and how each indicator may be supported or addressed, but the element of budget planning would not be included in the workgroup's focus.
 - Bridget Herrin added from a college perspective, the idea of the key performance indicators (with some being Districtwide metrics) are appreciated, which brings recognition to common efforts.
 - Antonio Alarcón shared that the committee is in the beginning steps in discussing how the group will move forward in the development of a new strategic plan, and welcomed feedback and various approaches in how the committee will progress.
 - The current format of the Annual Update to the Strategic Plan is more of a narrative style. Alarcón shared it would be nice to show metrics in a future Annual Update which is broken down by each institution, as well as, the District tied to the committee's planning process.
 - Daniel Miramontez inquired whether the committee may include a District representative from Human Resources in order to inform institutions in its development of various plans (master, operating, human resources, technology, facilities).
 - Susan Topham announced Vice Chancellor, Greg Smith, who joined the meeting.
 - Greg Smith introduced himself to the committee, and agreed with the committee's request.

4. Thematic Analysis Development Discussions

- a. Antonio Alarcón inquired with the institutions about how the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office *Vision for Success* Goals are addressed in its Strategic Plans. Alarcón asked the group for feedback pertaining to any movement in its metrics with respect to the 20% change over 5 years.
 - Bridget Herrin shared that about two years ago; all of the colleges submitted goals to the District which was reviewed at a Board of Trustee's meeting. At Mesa College, both *Vision for Success* Goals, and the Student Success metrics are being developed and incorporated into the current Strategic Plan.
 - Daniel Miramontez shared that in 2019, Miramar College reviewed *Vision for Success* goals in the compliance reporting. Miramar also worked with various metrics on the state side, and since then, much of the strategic key performance indicators have been tied to the *Vision for Success* goals. In addition, Miramar is working on metrics for Guided Pathways.
 - Susan Murray shared at City College, there has been internal focus on its institution standards. City College is in the midst of reviewing governance structures, and monitoring its entities so that engagement from various consistencies is included. The target for this work is to begin in the fall 2021.
 - Bonnie Dowd shared the history of District operations in where autonomy lies with each institution. While the District is held accountable for its *Vision for Success* goals, the institutions remain accountable for its Accreditation. The District allocates funding, and while institutions may receive variable funding percentages, Dowd recommends the District respect the process of the institutions providing input into the Strategic Plan, and the District support these challenges. It's important to remember the District does not define what the institutions are doing as its Accreditation is earned by each college developing and achieving its own goals.
 - Jessica Luedtke shared the College of Continuing Education is beginning conversations in its Strategic Plan, reviewing goals and perspectives at the intuitional level, and outlining actions which meet objectives and goals. Luedtke anticipates themes will be identified in these discussions.
 - Laura Murphy inquired about how autonomy and accountability may be shown for an institution when levels are recommended or mandated, and not met.
 - Susan Topham agreed these discussions were all valid points, and recommends further committee discussions moving forward. The

committee could review expectations from a state and federal level with respect to community colleges that would assist the institutions in seeing the bigger picture. Topham recognized Strategic Planning is an appropriate venue where these issues are discussed, and taken to appropriate stakeholder groups.

- Greg Smith inquired whether each institution is expected to be responsive to all of the *Vision for Success* goals, or does the institution select specific goals to focus efforts.
 - Antonio Alarcón shared that while the *Vision for Success* goals are system-wide, and all of SDCCD's colleges contribute toward achieving the 20%, the colleges are still work toward selecting its goals.
 - Bonnie Dowd shared in recollection of the SDCCD Strategic Planning process, goals are identified through conversations in this committee upon hearing from each of the colleges. The District does not establish the goals. Each institution establishes its goals and planning process, and recommends improvement areas, and identifies when further District support is needed.
 - Greg Smith reiterated that if each SDCCD institution sets its goals, this committee can work toward Districtwide goals. In turn, the Chancellor's Cabinet can work to identify any potential gaps, and provide its feedback.
 - Daniel Miramontez agreed with Smith offering that Miramar has typically approached strategic planning where each college is independent, and sets benchmarks. Benchmarks are based upon key performance indicators, coupled with *Vision for Success*, and the District is accountable for the Student-Centered Funding Formula. Miramontez recommends identifying an agreed upon ground for coordination with this committee.
 - Brennan Pearson shared he sat on an equity funding committee at Miramar College, and was interested in how the equity gaps and funding are identified.
 - Antonio Alarcón stated each college does an analysis of student equity outcomes, then it is calculated where the college can identify gaps, and which key performance indicator shares focus. Analysis is reviewed annually, and trends start to emerge.
 - Bonnie Dowd offered perspective to the committee in recognizing the various ages of the colleges. With two of the colleges being roughly 100 years old, and two operating in its 60's-70's, there are budget challenges to be sure the District does not take away funding from an older college to support a newer college, and vice versa. There are

times budget presents challenges in these areas. The question is, how can we realign funds to ensure equity and funding for each of the institutions? Each institution, as well as the District, may have different goals, but the goals the committee sets in the strategic plan are developed by looking at each of the campus' goals.

- Bonnie Dowd shared there is an equity adjustment within the Student-Centered Funding Formula. Dowd recommended the committee to keep in mind with the College of Continuing Education being non-credit status, it does not share in the Student-Centered Funding Formula which then the college cannot generate outcomes. The District has unique challenges due to the size of College of Continuing Education. Unfortunately, federal/stimulus monies are not providing for non-credit, however, the District provides funding as the credit colleges support the recognized value.
- Mashahiro Omae inquired if the District were able to assist with more data analysis, it would smooth over some of the challenges. There is interest in analyzing the longevity of a student experience to learn more than what the state's data is requiring. The goal is to be more proactive about planning, and to make sure students are being served to the best of our ability.
- Natalia CV Alarcón expressed interest in learning which data would be helpful so that it can be addressed.

Action Item: *Natalia CV Alarcón will reach out to Mashahiro Omae to learn more about the data analysis support request.*

- Laura Murphy shared an interest in seeing more institution coordination with Guided Pathways to assist students. With varied elements of the program at each institution, it may help to coordinate and offer consistency across campuses from a students' perspective.
- Bridget Herrin shared that with so many of the students attending all of the colleges, there is interest in a District plan which offers a Districtwide vision to give the colleges an opportunity to align under that shared vision.
- Natalia CV Alarcón agreed with Herrin, and shared the data shows 25%-30% of students attend classes in multiple colleges within our district.
- Daniel Miramontez shared Miramar researching a program mapper (in essence, a catalog) in coordination with the District Office. Miramontez recommends having a conversation where all colleges talk to a common mapper.

- Susan Topham attended a recent meeting where this topic was discussed. The group will be researching this further, and will enlist Information Technology's assistance to review the capabilities.
- Laura Murphy inquired about a Guided Pathways group that used to meet, and asked if the group is still meeting. It was suggested these discussions may have been held within the VPI/VPSS meetings in the last year or two.
- Miramontez thanked the committee members for allowing these conversations to expand into a robust dialog.

Action Item: Susan Topham will review the VPI/VPSS meeting notes from recent years and explore how the committee can begin to coordinate Guided Pathways.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.