PRESIDENT'S CABINET RETREAT
Friday, March 2, 2012
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Mission Trails Regional Park – Visitor's Center Meeting Rooms

AGENDA

The retreat began at 9:24 a.m.

Attendance:
Pamela Luster, President
Cathy Palestini, Recording Secretary
Kathy Wells, Senior Office Manager
Jonathan Fohrman, Dean, Arts and Languages
Pedro Olvera, Counselor, EOPS
Monica Romero, Student Services Supervisor: Transfer/Evaluations/Career
Angela Liewen, Instructional Lab Technician / President, Classified Senate
Kris Clark, Faculty / Program Review Chair
Jan Ellis, Faculty / Chair, PE, Health Education & Athletics
Lina Heil, Information Officer
Madeleine Hinkes, Faculty / Academic Senate President
Laurie Mackenzie, Faculty / Chair of Chairs
Michelle "Toni" Parsons, Faculty / Co-Chair, Curriculum Committee
Jill Jansen, Faculty / DSPS Coordinator
Dr. Chris Sullivan, Acting Dean, Humanities
Donald Abbott, Faculty
Margie Fritch, Dean, Health Sciences and Public Service
Dr. Jill Baker, Dean, Business, Computer Studies and Technologies
Dr. Saeid Eidgahy, Dean, Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Bill Craft, Dean, Learning Resources & Technology
Dr. Charlie Zappia, Dean, Social/Behavioral Sciences and Multicultural Studies
Dave Evans, Dean, PE, Health Education & Athletics
Michael Roth, SD Mesa College Student, PIE Committee
Charlotta Robertson, Acting Dean, Instructional Services
Cherie Deogracias, SD Mesa College Student, President, ASG
Larry Maxey, Acting Dean, Student Affairs
Ashanti Hands, Acting Dean, Student Development & Matriculation
Michael McLaren, Acting Supervisor, Library and Audio Visual
Ron Perez, VPA
Tim McGrath, VPI
Bri Hayes, Campus-Based Researcher
S. Beth Cain, EA to the President

9:00 a.m.	**Continental Breakfast**	
9:24 a.m.	**Welcome & Introductions** President Luster welcomed all to the Retreat. Nametags were distributed. Self introductions were made by all.	**Luster**
9:40 a.m.	**Review of the Agenda** Luster reviewed the agenda for the day. **Ground Rules** Luster asked for suggestions as to the "Ground Rules" for the day's discussion. • Margie Fritch - use the "golden rule": Treat others how you want to be treated. • Dave Evans - if it's already been said, don't say it again. • Kathleen Wells - one person speaks at a time. • Jill Baker - we show respect and support for some risk-taking – new ideas may be alien; respect and honor this risk-taking. • Lina Heil – that we hear from those who worked on some of the topics to be discussed. • Luster - use the "step up/step down" method: If you aren't saying much step up; if you are saying too much step down. Take care of each other. • Jan Ellis - honor our history but be willing to let go if needed. • Cherie Deogracias – create an environment where people are not afraid to ask questions. Some may be experts but others may not know. • Mike Roth – speak clearly. • Saeid Eidgahy – be implicit in all of these agenda items and rules – it would be helpful to clearly articulate the impact and benefit to students. Luster emphasized people should speak up as we go along if they feel we need to adopt additional ground rules. It needs to be an environment where people say what they need to say. If acronyms are being used, we can slow down and provide an explanation. **Outcomes for the Day** Luster indicated the outcomes for the day were to use the information provided by subject experts, including the Planning an Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee and create the next iterations or set of guide posts for Mesa to go forward with planning. It is required that we capture how we are getting there. It's not just about the end line. There are new ideas in this room and levels of expertise. The goal is to come out with a product that will be shared with the rest of the campus. Luster reviewed that we took current planning and went to the next level. Also, we as a college spent a lot of time discussing integrated planning and implementing it. The next step is to decide how we are going to do it. She noted it may be accomplished through President's Cabinet or Program Review or groups may be created to	

	work on the goals set during today's discussions. We must operationalize where we are headed.	
9:50 a.m.	**Setting the Scene (Scan for External Factors for Planning)**	
	• **Budget Update**	**Perez**
	Ron Perez provided an update on the budget. He noted the history since the budget reductions of 2008. Mesa was hit hard in 2008. We account for 30% of the total district budget. Discretionary was cut by 50%. He noted we are doing an excellent job of managing our budgets. District used to fund us $140 per FTEF, now it is $70 and the lowest we can go. Also the number of staff has decreased. To date we have lost 14 classified, and one associate manager.	**Luster** **Hays**

The District reduced $30 million from its budget. We budgeted for Tier 2 but in February, the State said enrollment revenue was not up so we were hit with another $6 million. The Chancellor's message indicates things keep changing and we are using reserves to pay expenses in the mean time. Perez indicated that at some point, using reserves would no longer be an option and the District will begin asking for concessions.

Donald Abbott asked Perez to address the reserves. Perez reported the District keeps a percentage in reserves for economic uncertainties. How much have we used? Perez indicated we have used less than 20% of our reserves. However, he noted that come November, things may get tough if one of the ballot initiatives does not pass. Planning for Fall 2012 is in full swing so the budget will be revisited for Spring 2013 and Tim McGrath will be presenting further information on this item.

We have a Budget Committee that receives budget updates. He wanted the group to know that we are in a financial crisis, however, he will find a way to fund necessary items as needs arise and all other avenues of funding have been exhausted. Perez noted past practice was if Mesa finished with a positive budget balance, we got to keep it. Since 2009, these monies are returned to the District. The initiative for colleges to save money decreased. Now, there is a belief that all monies need to be spent. Additionally, we used to be able to keep money for technology however $800,000 was cut from equipment reserve dollars. His office is preparing a report containing four years of discretionary spending and encourages us to look for areas within our departments to reallocate dollars. Some folks are not spending all monies and these can be reallocated to areas that need it. This report will be available in the next two weeks.

Charles Zappia asked about the $70 amount per student and in what base year was the dollars taken from? Perez noted the amount was $146 in 2008 but reduced to $98 in 2009. The student numbers came from Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES). The

budget is based on the prior year so if it was $140 it is now $70. Also, Perez noted when we had vacancies the salary savings was kept here and used for other areas. Now, those monies are returned to the District. There are no funds to hire someone in between the hiring of a replacement. Roth asked if we tapped into reserves in 2008 and at the current rate, how long will it last? Perez explained we tapped into it in 2010 but he does not have a figure in mind as to how much longer it will last. He estimated perhaps another 3-4 years.

- **Student Success Task Force**
  Luster reviewed a PowerPoint. It is a Student Success Task Force presentation the Chancellor and Cynthia Rico-Bravo made for the Board of Trustees. This presentation is made with the context of our District in mind. She noted it is a long process state-wide to come up with these recommendations. Some are legal challenges that would have to be made and others are broad rules used in our own system. There was a push for this: Outcomes accountability and the idea of budgeting based on performance. We have concerns about being paid for performance. She provided a history on Bill 1143.

- **Recommendations**
  1. Increasing college and career readiness – collaborate with K-12. Challenge – all community colleges have different entry criteria depending on courses/placement.

  2. Strengthen support for entering students – by implementing centralized assessment/placement/common K-12 standards. Encourage students to declare program of study upon admission. Also intervene if no declaration made by end of their third term.

  3. Incentivize student behaviors – reprioritize – system-wide enrollment priorities – make progress towards educational goal. Also Board Of Governors Waiver – add conditions. Difficult to implement with no additional funding.

  4. Align course offering to meet student needs

  5. Improve the education of basic skills students. The idea that certain number of levels below college level – need dialogue to see how far we go to support our students. Give priority to those who have it together – careful not to take out some of our vulnerable students. We will not have enough resources to serve everyone who wants us over time and need to make tough decisions – but we are situated to help see that students don't "fall off a cliff".

  6. Revitalize and re-envision professional development

7. Enable efficient statewide leadership and increase coordination among colleges. A strong state to help students. Wells asked about alignment – K12 and other colleges. Parsons indicated it is worse in math – students come to us after two years of no math in high school. Luster asked how do we build a bridge? Baker indicated that the San Diego Unified is not changing the way they do things but Sweetwater Unified went to a rhetoric-based system and as a result, test scores went up. Some districts take risks and these practices may bleed over to other districts. Fohrman asked when did the gap get so wide? Luster responded that it happened when we started de-funding K-12 and community colleges. In the past, there were a lot of meetings held to help with student success – not a lot of that work has sustained itself over time. People are underwater as to how to help with student success and can only control what is in front of them. Fritch noted the high school exit exam was part of the reason for this gap. Resources were diverted to that exam and it tanked quickly.

Laurie McKenzie indicated students want to know what's on the test because they don't have those skills. Chris Sullivan noted the California content standards for English and math are such that there is no way to accomplish all those areas. Baker reflected on her years of teaching K-12 and one thing she would say is they were so overly ambitious when those standards were written that it has disenfranchised students early on. It is a big reason why we are not seeing the development in education that would bring students along. It is now an outrageous standard that kids are not ready for and they will continue to fail. The standards are being revised. Luster added that a score card is being updated.

8. Align resources with student success recommendations.

Luster noted the full report is posted online. It is a state-wide recommendation and there are bills that have been drafted and are ready to carry this implementation.

Madeleine Hinkes asked whose measure of success is it? Luster explained the dialogue on the Task Force. It is a tough situation and we have not defined "success" in a meaningful way. Parsons asked if "success" is in numbers (certificate/degrees). She wondered about the score card and if we put their score card together with our own that has qualitative date with input from students. There are different ways to measure success. Parsons added she would like to see that documented. Luster noted we need to help define success and have opportunities to talk about retention/SLOs.

Deogracias asked about the score card and whether or not students are going to have a say in the process. She added another question: How we were able to have a say with the student success task force? Luster

recommended this question be directed to Statewide leadership.

Fritch added her concern, noting disappointment with seeing curriculum individuals on the Task Force who are successful but not included in discussion. Fohrman indicated given the irony of so many recommendations, this plan is coming out without being tied to funding. He asked if there is realistic discussion on how to support and operationalize it and what happened when funding went down. Luster explained the State Chancellor said this project "won't take money". She noted it is tough when our leaders say we can do it and then reprioritize resources. Much of the dialogue is how to rewrite that message. Through some professional organizations, people start to cost it out and once the numbers emerge, she predicts those discussions will be interesting. Going back to some success data from matriculation, some reports were unbelievable. It is time to pull out that data to show we were doing it well but we did not get any money and if we hire there no funding for it. This work is to set the stage for things coming our way.

McKenzie asked to what extent external forces will feed into accreditation. Luster indicated so far the only thing from the Commission is some dialogue in Standard Three, nothing in Standard Two. Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is famous for doing their own thing. She felt there is enough in the current standards.

Pedro Olvera noted this is a student-friendly thing but it pitted programs together. EOPS has been around for 30 years and they have already accomplished a lot of these items. When it is all said and done we need to be aware that funding is going to be necessary. Categoricals have been doing this for years with soft money. Up until three years ago, we have not been cut. His concern is matriculation. EOPS and DSPS will need instructional support. Working with a small group of students and legislators is not something he sees as cost-effective. We are still operating on soft money and we need to stand together (even though we know this already).

- **AARC Report**
  Brianna Hays reviewed the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) Report. She indicated the software used, called Prezi, is what she used for this presentation. It is a "zooming" presentation software that looks like a poster. She made some discussion points and hit the highlights.

Hays noted the Chancellor's office released a draft of this report in February. The final version is due in March. This report is about our students. She gave a background on AARC noting it was created in response to AB 1417. It is a preliminary score card for all community colleges. The State Chancellor's office performs the "number crunching" to create this report.

This report is intended to make campus leaders/policy makers and the community aware of how colleges are performing. Hays noted what's important and what do we want to measure.

There are three categories:
1. degree/certificate/transfer – student progress and achievement rate (a percent of a cohort); percent of students who earn at least 30 units (cohort within 6 years); persistence rate (cohort).

2. vocational/workforce development – success rate for vocational courses.

3. pre-collegiate improvement – success rate for basic skills courses; basic skills improvement rate; ESL Improvement Rate (looks at cohort who progressed to higher level course in that area).

Hays noted there are two types of comparisons: Year-to-year and Mesa-to-Mesa. These comparisons are used to see trends. Mesa is compared to a group of colleges with similar characteristics. The State looked at areas and they looked at related factors to those indicators. They looked at demographics, etc. in group colleges. Mesa has its own peer group and the State provided summary data. A question was asked if the cohort continues throughout the years. Hays explained the State Chancellor's Office used to continue work on the cohort each year but it became confusing as the peer group would change. Last year they froze the peer groups and in the future they will change how they do it because it takes a lot of resources. Luster indicated we like the peer group in order to rate ourselves against others in our group. Parsons asked how many colleges are in our group and Hays indicated it is a lengthy list that can be discussed at a separate meeting. Hays added the peer group is time-based and indicator-based. It gives us a benchmark indicating we are doing well.

Hays provided a visual of Mesa's pages from the AARC report, indicating Mesa's is five pages long. The State Chancellor's office has MIS data and data cleanups are in progress. Last year's data is different for this reason. The data is dynamic. Hays reviewed the Mesa-to-Mesa highlights and then the peer-to-peer comparisons as follows:

Overall, Mesa improved or exceeded the peer group average on

four areas – student progress/achievement rate 62%; persistence rate 70%; ESL improvement rate 60%; Basic Skills improvement rate 48%.

Mesa needs to make progress on:
Percent of students who earn at least 30 units 68% - lots of factors such as cut classes and fee increases. She asked us to think about what we can do to target that – explore areas to see why. Hinkes asked if numbers are being reported would it change the interpretation. Hays explained there is a self-assessment piece and we now have a chance to respond before they finalize the report. Parsons asked whether or not it was 30 units on one campus or anywhere. Hays replied it is anywhere in the community college system. Also, Parsons asked with the tough economy and students having to work more – she is interested to see our peer group – San Diego is more expensive than other areas. Will take those students longer? Baker indicated that enrollment software will help us track this in the future. Eidgahy added an example that UCSD is a major transfer institution and a majority of undergrads require science labs – students come to Mesa – we need to start looking at more critical things that people normally don't see. Hays added based on recommendations and the score card, the hope is for AARC to evolve into that (we hope).

Hays continued discussing items we need to make progress on:
Basic skills success rate 59% - we are around the same we were a few years ago and still below the peer group average. On the plus side students are progressing into higher level basic skills courses. This is for the entire year, not a cohort. Parsons noted success rates back to matriculation and lack of resources. There is no proper assessment or orientation and students wait to take math at the last minute. All of that becomes a mental block which prevents them from being successful. Tim McGrath noted that a student services interactive software called "AVATAR" will help provide information to students on their Education Plan. Though scores have not changed we are working hard on another avenue and will see results. Until we make significant changes with partners in K-12 the whole state struggles. We must come up with new things we can do. Deogracias added statistics are compared to the one prior – overall improvement – is this persistence and this is success? Hays indicated yes – did they pass or not – one is a cohort and the other is point in time for all areas. Parsons noted this is basic skills as we have coded it. Eidgahy added some areas are discreet and separate work. Recently we are approaching things in a more holistic fashion and will produce a noticeable difference but it will take time. Hays indicated anything we do now will be reported next year. This information gives a snapshot as how we are moving forward. Fohrman asked how much below the peer group are we? Hays replied we are below the peers by 4%, noting

	the high for peer is 76%. Success rate for vocational courses is 69% we are lower compared to our score in the past.	
	Hays noted the next steps involve sharing this data with the campus community and analyze results/discuss. Also, we should develop strategies to improve these figures in the future.	
10:45 am	**Break (after the Accreditation Activity)**	**All**
11:05 a.m.	**Accreditation Activity** – Luster indicated each group would come up with 2 questions (for a total of 8 questions). Then, each group asked another group until all 8 questions were answered. **Group 1 asked Group 2:** What was Recommendation #3 for Administrative Services? **Answer:** It was about integrating administrative services, program review and resource allocation. **Group 3 asked Group 4:** What body authorizes ACCJC? **Answer:** U.S. Department of Education and the Commission for Higher Education Accreditation. **Group 2 asked Group 3:** What three things were successful in our accreditation process? **Answer:** Student affairs, online library resources/services, faculty hiring priorities. **Group 4 asked Group 1:** What is a substantive change report? **Answer:** An example is the presentation of an online program. Definition – a major change – like a change of a program – to be approved by ACCJC. Some are substantive and some are not. **Group 1 asked Group 3:** As of Jan 2012, what was one of the most common reasons for institutions on sanction? **Answer:** Integrated planning. **Group 4 asked Group 2:** According to ACCJC standards, at what level does the college have to attain regarding SLOs? **Answer:** Proficiency. **Group 2 asked Group 4:** What role does the District play on accreditation? **Answer:** Districts are not accredited but according to some of the standards there are some responsibilities they need to meet in order to make sure the colleges meet the standard. **Group 3 asked Group 1:** Can you tweet explanation of accreditation to @SDMesaPrez? **Answer:** The manner by which institutions of higher ed are held accountable by regional bodies. (88 characters - Yes you can!)	
11:30 a.m.	**Recommendations from the PIE Committee** Luster recognized the members present from the PIE Committee, noting they will describe work PIE has accomplished to date. Last year, this work was under the leadership of Elizabeth Armstrong. We	**Hays** **Baker** **Luster**

	are now looking more in-depth at this work.	**McGrath**

- **College Goals Crosswalk**
  Hays led the group through this activity using a handout. She indicated essentially the crosswalk involves integrating a couple of themes and being able to mesh them to see where there are areas of overlap or gaps. At the PIE retreat, the group looked at goals and objectives as well as key performance indicators. That was a great framework. A helpful tool was to make a crosswalk between the two. Discussion with PIE included a determination of what needed to be updated and where gaps existed. Determine what areas are being measured.

  All four college goals were reviewed and listed on the handout along with notes, especially under goal two. These goals stay the same from year to year and are broad. What we do for each goal falls under those areas. The next part is the objectives listed under each goal. Annual priorities – what we will do this year toward accomplishing our goals. The fourth area is performance indicator – how to measure progress. The scorecard ID is listed along with a description of the scorecard. Abbott noted the crosswalk is a convenient tool that brings together the blue fields on the integrated planning flowchart.

  Goal #1, Objective A, Hays noted it is a hallmark of a higher education institution – a national issue – important to us. Both topics under the performance indicators come from the AARC report. Objective B – transfer volume and transfer rate comes from District. Objective C – came out of discussions at PIE – she asked how do we drill down or push for an increase at the College level? Objective D – we measure it with forums and workshops and feedback from faculty about the opportunities available. Objective E – from PIE Committee – need to be proficient in 2012 as well as determine priority. There are two suggestions listed on the handout. It is a holistic approach using the scorecard.

  Goal #2 – Objective A, Hays noted we could develop this for ourselves at little or no cost and that survey results would be the indicator. Objective B – identify barriers to student success. Objective C – a survey is being launched next week from District. This survey is administered every three years. This task is ongoing and results may be used to inform practices in the future. Objective D – disaggregated data to be used. Objective E – Mesa is already doing this: Fill rates are high and they are being tracked. We are serving more students with less available resources. Objective F – this was identified last year but will be deferred. Objective G – up for discussion. The measurement and documentation of this item is to be determined. Objective H – this item is also to be determined.

Goal #3 – Objective A, – Hays noted this item is pass rates. Objective B – suggest numbers of students with SEPs on file.

Goal #4 – Objective A, – Hays noted this item was recommended by PIE for further discussion on how to measure it. Objective B – recommend continued EEO and diversity training. Objective C – District conducted a survey in the fall and the results will be analyzed for Mesa to move forward.

Luster noted the PIE Committee has already done the "heavy lifting" for us. This afternoon's discussion will include further work and discussion of this topic.

Hays explained the scorecard handout, noting that last year these areas were identified. This document should be shared and discussed with the various constituent groups in the future. This is a good way to track progress in those areas. Hays provided background information on the development of the scorecard. She noted the red light means "well below", yellow means "slightly below", and green means "met or exceeded". We are doing well on student outcomes (including progress/achievement rate; transfer; certificates conferred; course success/retention rates; persistence rate; licensure/certificates, etc.). We are making progress on the number of degrees conferred, students earning 30 or more units, basic skills course success rates and vocational course rates. We need to improve on basic skills improvement rate and diversity. There are stars next to some items that are for further discussion at another meeting/group.

Moving forward, Hays suggested the next steps:
- Review scorecard to assess feasibility
- Discuss indicators/changes
- Revise scorecard based on 2012-2013 objectives/feedback
- Collect scorecard data in fall 2012
- Report back to college in 2013

- **Utilization of Rubrics**
  Jill Baker led the discussion and distributed a handout for "Equipment". She explained the history, noting each group that allocates resources created their own rubric. There are three components: planning, outcomes, and evaluation. All are scored and these scores are used when allocating resources. These components demonstrate what is used to allocate resources. Under each component, there are criteria. Baker explained each point level from "highest level", "mid level", "minimum level" or "nil" used to grade it. If the information provided is clear, it fits into one of the point levels. If it is determined to mark "nil" then the process ends there. Requests for resources must be in the program

plans according to accreditation standards. This is why the program review process focuses on this point. Under the Planning component, there are several criteria: program review, college goals and/or priorities and/or SIT or facilities plans, health and safety, accreditation and licensure, replacement (for items snot covered by technology replacement plan).

There is one criteria for the Outcomes component – SLOs or AUOs or ILOs; one criteria under Evaluation component – Evaluation plan. Additional points are given for more specifics/direct links and level of need. We know we need to have program review, tie it to outcomes, and then evaluation of outcomes. This process closes the loop and includes the use of data. An evaluation plan will be developed in the future as a joint project with Hays. We must have an evaluation plan.

A handout for "Supplies" was distributed and contained identical components and scoring as the "Equipment" handout with one difference in the criteria for planning – having only four areas: program review, college goals and/or priorities and/or IT or facilities plans; health and safety; accreditation and licensure.

Eidgahy asked about submission of grants and the associated evaluation components. He noted that previous performance with grants is a serious factor that contributes to the award of future grants in that area. Baker noted deans will encourage the discipline faculty/staff to evaluate the resource they received. Fritch asked if these two rubrics are used for one time requests. Luster noted this topic will be addressed later in the discussion. Abbott reminded the group that program review is annual along with allocation by the "red zone" committees on the integrated planning flow chart.

Luster noted we must be sure to close the loop. Craft asked how do you not document you are a poor teacher if you are poorly supported – if SLOs depend on resources you receive. Luster replied that this is looked at collectively - not on an individual level. An area may have documented their needs and think they will be successful and if they get XYZ can do this XYZ.

- **Integration of Program Review**
  Luster noted that outcomes from discussion are not being imposed "after the fact" as program reviews are submitted. For the next year, she indicated we will determine what worked and what may be changed. Rubrics will be part of the discussion on how things should change for next year.

  In terms of integration with program review, determine what is

important. Faculty/staff pour their heart and soul into the document and use data. As a college, she will not second guess these statements and will take them at face value. If the program review document is poorly written, then it can be difficult to make any of these boxes on the form work. She added it is a "collective sigh", we all in this together with finite resources available. We can make the best case in program review.

Luster added what is missing is a validation step. We do not validate and in most program review processes, there is some type of peer validation. One group of faculty may be in a team to validate a program review outside their area to determine if data was used. As this dialogue continues into the next year, it will make the allocation process easier. The idea is to help lead writers make the best case they can. Luster admitted feedback is "scary"; knowing a lot of work went into the program review. She emphasized it is not a value judgment but rather a technical assistance to help strengthen the document. McKenzie noted for anyone involved in research and publication (and as educators) this concept is something we should be quite familiar with and put in that context, it would be a peer review as if we submitted our program review to a journal. Luster added it would be lead writer along with a group who would develop the review. Abbott expanded on what Luster said, noting the use of data to justify and explain. He was concerned that some faculty may think using data means my number was 76 and I get it – data is there for us to use – does this number betray that I am a bad teacher? Use the numbers as part of the explanation. Not just a list – it's your explanation – contextualize it. For example, it could be stated that "I succeed here" or "I need funds for that". Peer reviewers may say that is a good argument.

Luster emphasized we want to put our best foot forward. It is not a personal ranking. Collectively faculty/staff would come up with a plan to remediate problems that include data not just anecdotal information. Tie learning outcomes and continue to make the best case for use of resources.

- **This Year's Allocation Process**
  Luster indicated a hybridized model for the allocation process will be given by Tim McGrath. She noted it has been the work of the Strategic Planning Committee (the blue areas on the integrated planning flow chart). Luster added that Hays explained the blue area and Baker explained the yellow area. McGrath will be explaining the red area next.

  Luster noted the vice presidents will meet with supervisors and deans to review the needs outlined in the program reviews. There will be a one-time money amount that will come back to the

	allocation committees who will make recommendations. By the last meeting of the year, Luster will make her recommendations and notices will be sent to all involved to inform them of the outcome of their requests. In essence, Luster noted last year was vision and this year was the "worker bees". We are meeting the promises we made to create links to the strategic planning model. Abbott added one more point that while using this model, this year the red zone is being refined – it is being vetted through participatory governance at this time. The revised model will not be used this year. If approved, it will be used next year - that is the hybrid model. Luster indicated the group would be examining the efficacy of the model during an exercise later in the day. She asked: Where are we headed? Resource allocation has been a stumbling block in the past.	
12:20 p.m.	**LUNCH** **Group picture after lunch**	
1:00 p.m.	**Group Activity** Luster indicated the group activity was called "Sneak a Peek" – do we really know our planning process? For the 1st round, one person draws and another peeks in the Institutional Planning Manual. The one who peeked went back to the group and described the process as noted in the Manual to the "drawer". The "drawer" was only allowed to do what the "peeker" described. The team eventually was allowed to collaborate on the drawing for the 2nd round of the activity. **Team One:** Presented a chart with blue areas listed on the side – mission, vision, values, objectives and priorities. Described the integrated planning flow chart. Abbott asked for the names of each column (answers provided). The third drawn was the allocation recommendation process. The first column was listed as the strategic planning process. The middle column was listed as the program review process. Feedback goes to more than one area. **Team Two:** Presented the same chart as Team One but they added the academic year and some areas were slightly different. **Team Three:** Presented the same chart as Teams One and Two but included that PIE is integrated(coordination of programs across the campus) and that alignment is resource allocation in line with mission, vision, etc. **Team Four:** Presented the same chart as Teams One through Three but the first step in strategic planning – mission, vision, values was not included. They indicated the process goes to President's Cabinet but they are not the allocating body. Luster asked in terms of key items, which team most closely	**All**

	characterized the chart as it is today? Abbott replied it is split between Group One and Group Two.		

1:20 p.m.	**College Goals Recommendations**
	Luster led discussion regarding our four goals. Discussion focused on fleshing out some of the areas. She indicated this would not be a laundry list of all opportunities to meet goals, rather, it is our job to put together clear information for the college that is guided by the kinds of things the college collectively believes will help students succeed.
	
	Four groups were formed according to the four goals. The goal of the activity was to discuss/facilitate dialogue by one person in the group while another person in the group took notes. Then, the entire group would have a collective discussion. It was noted that PIE Committee suggested Goal #2 be split. Luster encouraged discussion among the members of Group #2 to consider this recommendation and formulate how this break would look if split.
	
	Luster noted the intent of this discussion was to memorialize what we did today and then send it to the PIE Committee so we can keep this moving forward. The process would begin again next year with some of these items in place.
	
	Group One:
	Goal #1 – Deliver and support exemplary teaching and learning.
	    a.) Institutionalize BSI monies?
	        • Inform measure (benchmark)
	        • A lot of conversation needs to happen.
	    b.) Define transfer success
	    c.) Curriculum review
	        • on the way and continuing (not only updating courses but also awards and certificates)
	        • programs as well as courses
	        • counseling (ongoing)
	    d.) Production of scholarly and creative works (Performance Indicator) certs/awards for faculty/staff (PI)
	    e.) Institutionalize student learning and assessment – migrate SLOs action plans assessment to CurricUNET. Discussion – block to adding them on the course outline due to the requirement that all three campuses are in agreement for that course. If we could take TaskStream data and transport it into CurricUNET we could have an addendum for SLOs. All information would be stored in one location and a report may be printed. Question from Wells – how to handle administrative services/student services information in CurricUNET? Answer: It is doable.
	        • Discussions on results.
	    The important part is to evaluate course results. The method to get to that point is going to take a lot of work.
		All	

Group Two: This group discussed the recommendation of splitting Goal #2. They discussed employee well-being and student success. They did not really come to a conclusion. They did not suggest changes to objectives A or B. But for C, they discussed employee perceptions – regardless if this goal would be split, or not, it was agreed the perceptions were not a really "good" measure. They asked specific questions: Is this something we would want to measure or should professional development activities be used along with support of professional growth? Should we target in that manner? Should the indicator drive the objective? For G, "increase transparency", did that aspect belong as well? It relates to an organizational goal as opposed to specific goals. They did not suggest any changes to H but asked whether or not it belonged as well.

Parsons added a comment based on discussion at a basic skills meeting. She noted this comment also relates to earlier discussion, asking "what is success?" She wondered if there was a way to have an exit survey for students, for example, if they took spring classes but did not take fall classes. Is there a way to ask them why? Luster responded that it was a great idea but one area of difficulty has been with measurements. A subcommittee of PIE is being developed to focus on measurements.

Group Three: Respond to community needs or community and workforce development. On 3a – maintain licensure, etc. – annual priority said to "enhance". They did not see how that fit. Change annual priority – increase performance level of student learning outcomes. They suggested keeping "certification" as-is. Objective B was discussed with no revisions. They added a third objective to respond to those needs - to develop new courses or programs. Annual priority for that would be to conduct a needs assessment – course and program approvals. Luster added this links us to how our students learn.

Group Four: They discussed Objective A – priority rather than creating initiatives – they felt we already have a lot of that so their suggestion was to assess what we have now. The wording they suggested was "college-wide assessment of student learning and administrative unit outcomes pertaining to global awareness and diversity". They felt we did not necessarily need more but that we have not done a "formal assessment". That's a good annual priority that should be done annually as part of the SLO requirement (proficiency). It could be a good test case that shows where there are gaps. The performance indicator would be assessment results. Ashanti Hands added though we did not go through the entire guide, a future objective would be to create some type of evaluation measure with a performance appraisal that looks at cultural competence, honoring diversity, global awareness, DSPS, etc.

	Luster congratulated the groups on the work they accomplished in this short amount of time.	
2:07 p.m.	**BREAK**	**All**
2:20 p.m.	**Review and Assess Integrated Planning Model** Luster indicated as a follow up to the last activity, Hays will be adding this information to the crosswalk using a color to indicate those revisions were result of today's discussion. In this manner, all revisions are tracked in the approval process of that document. She noted that the next topic for discussion is a review of the planning process; where we are now, noting the blue/yellow/red areas from the integrated planning flow chart. Currently, we are in the red area. She added there is a lot of activity underway at this time and we should be mindful of maintaining trustful relationships with each other while not "wasting anyone's time". She indicated the goal is to review this process to determine if there are areas of redundancy, if some of those tasks could be assigned to existing committees, or if the process should remain unchanged. Luster added this is a topic for discussion on an annual basis at a retreat session. Luster noted we have all these indicators – a safe zone – the blue area. She indicated uncertainty about the yellow area in terms of prioritization. The red area is for review and dissemination by the PIE Committee. Then, the process moves forward to the President's Cabinet and finally at the President's level. She discussed the idea of bringing decisions back to one group (equipment and supplies) rather than PIE reviewing twice. Luster asked the group for their thoughts on how this idea could be implemented: Abbott explained the proposed changes to the red zone of the integrated planning model. Those areas should be refined and it should be determined which committees will be responsible for the tasks. He suggested a method to integrate each silo as it applies to the various aspects of resource allocation. He inquired about which body would be responsible to ensure this integration takes place, suggesting it should be the leaders of the various committees. It was suggested to have an Allocation Recommendation Process Committee (ARPC) to replace the PIE Committee. He explained when the PIE Committee met they discussed the impact of resource allocation on each silo, noting each aspect of resource allocation is reviewed by the individual silo. Integration among silos would mean, for example, an area would be granted the new faculty requested but would also obtain the necessary lab. Fritch inquired whether or not all the silos could be grouped into one committee and how to determine priority with one pot of funding. Abbott responded that during discussions among PIE Committee	**All**

members, the concern was how to approach the campus with a proposal to eliminate the familiar silo committees and replace them with one "super committee". He asked the group if it would be logical to have such a committee and Fritch responded that one committee would create efficiency and transparency. Luster indicated it would take about 18 months to completely move forward into the cycle. Fritch suggested postponing the next program review cycle to help adjust this timeframe. The current program review documents could be used for next year's process. Then, the process would begin at the end of the spring semester for funding consideration the following fall semester. This would allow plenty of budgetary time.

Kris Clark inquired whether or not there was a Budget Committee. Luster indicated there is a Budget Committee and Perez added there have not been any meetings lately due to the budget situation. It was suggested to expand the role of Budget Committee by adding a subcommittee. The Budget Committee is accustomed to allocating year end dollars but the idea of a "super committee" could expand its role. Fritch noted it would be a large committee but each member would submit their individual evaluation and then discuss as a group. Even if there were 50 people on the committee, it would be effective if there was a tool (a succinct process and rubrics in place).

McKenzie inquired about the membership of that committee, noting it must have representation from a cross-section of the campus. This aspect may have been missing in the past, before the PIE Committee. Roth suggested forming a "super-silo committee" with a representative from the Budget Committee.

Baker noted that conceptually program review is going through the prioritization process using goal matrices, attachments etc. It would be good to have centralization with a committee that uses rubrics. With 75 programs/service areas using this process, it affects the conceptual level. She indicated it is not clear how the program reviews would move forward through the prioritization process because they will be split up when reviewed by several committees. She suggested finding a way to simplify and streamline. Baker added that a program review feedback session is being planned for this month. Luster indicated that we may be able to use technology to assist.
Craft noted the timeframe involved with obtaining faculty versus the facilities they need to teach. He suggested a two to three year continuum be built into this process rather than one fiscal year.

Luster inquired about those areas that have prioritization processes. Hinkes suggested bringing these areas together as one instead of "re-writing" the existing committees.

Clark inquired about prioritization at the school and division level and

how that information is communicated. Luster indicated this is where technology could assist. There is a need for an electronic method for program review. Baker added her agreement with the technological aspect of program review, envisioning that the school sets the priority and then it moves on in the process. Luster indicated there is a need to streamline.

Parsons noted currently, program review and prioritization is taking place but then there is an update in the fall. She inquired about the necessity for such an update. Luster indicated discussion is on both ends of the spectrum. Parsons added with changes in her department, they are working to accomplish these tasks. She wondered if instead of an update, a "regrouping" could take place before it is sent to the Budget Committee. Luster indicated lead writers could be the drivers in that case.

Fohrman indicated the fundamental question is feasibility. He inquired if the committees "weed out" several applications and should a program/service area request faculty if they get "weeded out". He also inquired whether or not those committees review all prioritizations and goals. He added that the assumption is that the requests move forward even they are not prioritized. This model is not feasible if everything moves forward. There should be another way to make it more efficient.

Abbott indicated that a very difficult issue raised is that people are assigned tasks by definition of their jobs but also they should have the satisfaction of a hearing. Deans and Vice Presidents have a responsibility to help make decisions and that is why prioritization was created. He added that with program review, all program/service areas have a right to be heard by the committee that reviews them. Deans need to give their input as to their prioritization but the committee needs to see all program reviews.

Fohrman inquired about the definition of "prioritization" if everything goes forward. Abbott noted prioritization would be honored with an explanation attached to it.

Luster noted it takes a while to get into the swing of things and the idea is people would not ask for 24 things in one year and we do not need to prioritize to the 150th degree. As rubrics are developed, we will work through all these aspects.

Wells inquired about the point system, once at a certain point level, whether or not the request is forwarded to the silos. Luster explained the silos are using rubrics to score them. She recommended removing the red square under the yellow box (the PIE committee square – PIEC review and dissemination) on the right. We could group everything or have technology that groups everything into the areas as

needed. Abbott added even if technology helps group information, the areas still need to communicate with each other. This communication brings us back to the idea of one large committee.

Fritch noted that it has been dictated that certain information needs to be in program review. Some information may or may not be looked at but it needs to be done on a yearly basis. The bulk of the work takes place in the other three areas, not the Human Resources (HR) silo. Luster added we have classified and faculty prioritization and asked where would those recommendations go from HR and where does it report back. Roth indicated removal of the flow from President's Cabinet to the silos. Liewen Romeo added the Budget Committee was listed and HR goes back to that committee and other silos should be added to the Budget Committee.   Discussion continued concerning the areas that go into HR: Contract/classified/ possibly NANCEs and adjuncts.

Hands noted the process appears to be so isolated we are not sure what each group does. She hears there are committees that may be against coming together. She suggested integration be done and at some point the groups get together to see what the processes look like to determine if we can move toward one budget committee. It is important for us to move toward one committee so the process is easy to understand.

Abbott noted more than four committees exist than what are listed: VTEA, IELM etc. but they are not integrated.

Luster inquired if there is "heartburn" over the word "budget" and the consensus of the group was "NO".

Luster suggested combining equipment and supplies. Then have facilities committee and then the HR piece. It could be a large Budget Committee with three arms without HR; do not break up the HR processes.   We could repopulate based on broad representation and convert the Budget Committee to a Budget and Allocation Recommendation Committee (BARC). The PIE Committee has been a bridge to get to this point. In the end, an Institutional Effectiveness Committee could looks at how we do our planning and allocate our resources and then evaluates the College at the "30,000 foot level". She thought this was something we will eventually move toward. The process would be reviewed at the institutional level and make recommendations from there. This method would indicate our priorities and where we actually spent our money. We would need a "boots on the ground" group for when allocations are submitted, they could review them holistically. The PIE Committee would exist but would be removed from both areas.

Evans inquired whether or not the Budget Committee should be listed

below the silos. Luster explained that conceptually, the budget would be kept in mind along the way. In either May or in the fall of the following year, we would set a timeline for the areas to complete their work (when the lists are submitted). The Program Review Committee would not need to do all the work to organize this process.   The Budget Committee would then report on the allocations that were made as a result of the review by each area. The Budget Committee presents this information to the President's Cabinet. The Budget Committee would also work with the equipment and supplies requests. HR would do their part along with Facilities.

Abbott indicated that in this manner, the integration process could easily be explained to accreditors. Luster added the Budget Committee could establish a deadline for HR and Facilities to submit their priorities. Additionally, the Chair or Co-chairs of the Budget Committee would also serve as a member of the President's Cabinet. These individual(s) would be part of the discussion at President's Cabinet and at the PIE Committee level. As a result of this discussion, PIE was moved to the top of the screen.

Fritch noted we really the areas we can control are equipment and supplies. Facilities and HR are district areas. A silo for "Perkins" was added.

Luster suggested further discussion take place at the next President's Cabinet meeting to process these ideas and create a revised chart. There is a lot of crossover with PIE and President's Cabinet. Luster will send this information forward to the PIE Committee for discussion. We should determine the next steps with the revised information that is currently under review (ARPC). It is a good idea to compare the revisions that are under review with the ones made at the Retreat as there may be some similarities. Baker noted this process is evolving and will be simplified in a similar manner as the ARPC suggestion. It is more aligned with existing functions.

Abbott inquired whether or not the groups currently reviewing the revised ARPC process should be notified that additional revisions are going to be presented. He cautioned about moving forward depending on the outcome of the presentations of ARPC.

Liewen Romeo indicated she was in favor of these revisions being used as an evolutionary tool. Luster added after a previous retreat, that discussion took the best of ARPC and made further revisions in an attempt to "move forward". McGrath noted those recommendations were made to this group and ultimately, this discussion is in keeping with what the campus wants us to do.

McKenzie indicated that the focus should be on how these ideas should be presented, in her case, to the department chairs. Her

	challenge is how to present this information as part of an "evolution". She encouraged the other department chairs present to provide assistance during the department chairs meeting. Jill Jansen noted if these suggestions will simplify the process, then communication should be fairly easy. Fohrman expressed this discussion has been great and healthy. A lot of energy has been expended on the "plan to plan" but now we should move toward implementation and determine whether or not a streamlined and user-friendly approach can be used. At the same time, the process should include coordination among the areas, which is currently part of the issues faced. He suggested when this discussion is revisited, we should review the commission rubric in order to satisfy those needs as well as determine how SLOs fit into the picture. We appear to be hung up on the mechanics but there is a need to look at bigger picture. Parsons noted her agreement with the "budget circle"; it looks integrated as drawn with the arrows around it. When drawn as rectangles, the silos do not look integrated. Luster noted the importance of telling a story. She is working with Hays to set up a database as well as determine some areas of technology that are used to help faculty/staff. She would like to begin developing automation tools. She asked the group for a "thumps up" and they indicated their approval of further discussion of this topic at the next President's Cabinet and then forwarding information to the PIE Committee. She noted a lot of information was covered during this retreat.	
3:20 p.m.	**Wrap Up and Next Steps** Luster summarized that during the discussion, the group approved the goals for next year. Also, the group expressed their approval on the discussion and work to be continued at the next President's Cabinet. She thanked individuals who provided assistance with the set up and recording of minutes. She thanked the students for taking time to participate in discussion. Luster thanked the group for the energy today and looked forward to continuing discussion and work at the next President's Cabinet.	**Luster**

The Retreat concluded at 3:27 p.m.