

**Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District
Districtwide Coordinating Educational Council (DCEC)
Notes from 2/11/2011 Meeting**

Discussion: timeline and process

DCEC members expressed concern that the one-year timeline to complete the EMP is putting too much pressure on the staff – with SB1440, accreditation, assessment practices/SLOs, high student demand and budget cuts, etc. happening. The group noted that with the current economic outlook 2012 is not really realistic for a bond issue, so we don't have to try to develop the justification for new facilities this year.

The group then discussed the timeline for the educational master planning process. Group members noted that the fall convocations are the key for the planning process. Faculty representatives noted that the fall semester is the most intensive planning period for them, and suggested that it may be better to put the priority setting off to the spring 2012 semester. The group then discussed when their most intensive work periods are, and concluded that:

- Faculty have the most intensive work in the fall semester
- Administration and classified staff have their most intensive work in the spring semester
- Summer is the catch-up time for the classified staff

The group decided that for data gathering it may be easiest for faculty to contribute in the spring 2011 semester. Phyllis Sensenig would then work over the summer to prepare summaries of the scan team findings, which would then be sunshined at the fall convocation. The DCEC recommended that we change the timeline so that input is provided all spring semester, written up over the summer, then ready for fall convocation. Participants noted that this timeline may enable us to get 2010 census results and related projections.

Participants suggested that faculty and staff might recommend specific articles and other documents to be reviewed, rather than requiring that an analysis be included on the scan form (see below for discussion of scan team process).

The DCEC also recommended that we consider what committees and processes are already in place, and use already existing processes. Members recommended that we clarify the EMP timeline to show that existing committees will participate in the various activities, and specify on the timeline who/what groups will be participating in the various components (such as who is on the retreats, etc.).

Discussion: Scan team process

Chris Hill presented information on the scan team concept. She provided handouts that included a PowerPoint presentation on environmental scanning, trend analysis and forecasting; the taxonomy of change areas that Grossmont College used; the scanning abstract form that Grossmont College used; links to additional information about environmental scanning; and a summary of the output from Grossmont College's environmental scanning process. Chris noted that at Grossmont College, a wide range of people were involved in the scan teams, not just the

20% who tend to do everything. She noted that there is a lot of expertise on campus to be able to provide input. Grossmont College had 5 people per scan team, and had classified staff on each. An administrative chair pulled the information together; the summaries were then used to inform their strategic plan. The DCEC members noted that serving as the staff person to pull the information from the various scan teams together could be part of Phyllis Sensenig's role, which would save staff time and effort. The group noted that we also need to collect trends from community leaders; specific input collection needs would be determined through the scan teams.

The group discussed how we should collect information for the inventory of current programs that would be included in the completed EMP. Group members noted that program reviews do not really address the long-range goals. To avoid overloading faculty and staff time commitments, the group agreed that we should use the program descriptions already created and published in the catalogs.

The group then turned to a discussion of whether we should collect scan teams input online or via email. Options discussed including building a blackboard site for each scan team (adapting a blackboard template to do this), or using some other form of interactive forum. The DCEC asked the EMP Steering Committee to develop this solution.

The DCEC concluded that in addition to ensuring that the Academic and Classified Senates and student organizations have representatives on the scan teams, we should put out a call to the whole district to participate, explaining what is required and the obligations to be on the scan team. This would give anyone who is really interested in participating the opportunity to be on a scan team.

The DCEC then discussed the need to identify the taxonomy for the scan teams. Suggested groupings included:

- Demographics
- Economics
- Education
- Labor force
- Social values and lifestyles
- Technology
- Politics
- Advanced manufacturing (does this go under economics?)
- Climate and environment
- Energy and transportation
- Refugees and immigrants
- Funding

Cindy Miles noted that Pasadena CC used mission-critical priorities in their Educational Master Planning process. These priorities included:

- Student success, equity, and access
- Professional development
- Technology

- Pathways: K-12, two-year, four-year and community connections
- Student support services
- Institutional effectiveness
- Enrollment management
- Sustainability
- Revenue enhancement strategies
- Life-long learning
- Curriculum responsive to market needs
- Facilities and resource management

The group discussed the possibility that we then would report out the findings based on the five strategic focus areas. Members suggested that we take a look at how Marin CC did theirs.

The DCEC asked the EMP Steering Committee to identify the taxonomy for the scan teams.

Discussion: Document describing difference between strategic plan and educational master plan

The group reviewed the draft document. DCEC members noted that the strategic plan starts with goals; the educational master plan starts with questions – who are we? Who should we be?

The group concluded that we have to honor the psychological impact of the EMP in the light of all the other things going on at the Colleges. They recommended that the EMP Steering Committee re-craft the information for college groups about the EMP process to stress that this is not going to hurt, and to answer the question “What is this going to mean for me?”

Next Steps:

The next DCEC meeting is scheduled for March 18. In the interim, the EMP Steering Committee should:

- Identify the Scan Team taxonomy
- Develop the scanning process and formats.
- Revise the information to the colleges about the EMP and the scanning process
- Develop an invitation to participate on the scan teams

By March 18 we should be ready to start the scan team process.