**Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District**

**Educational Master Plan (EMP) Steering Committee**

**Notes from 1/12/2011 Meeting**

**Discussion: Terminology and definitions to avoid confusion about plans**

The Steering Committee listed the plans currently in place at the district and at each college (see table of Plans and Related Documents).

There are three Strategic Plans (GCCCD, Cuyamaca and Grossmont); each address the five common areas of focus, but there is not an overarching strategic plan. The five focus areas approved by the Governing Board are:

1. Student access
2. Learning and student success
3. Fiscal and physical resources
4. Economic and community development
5. Value and support of employees

Should the two College EMPs feed up to the district EMP, or the district EMP feed down to the colleges?

The question was raised whether we need a master staffing plan and an annual staffing plan for the district and the two colleges.

**Discussion: Contents of the Educational Master Plan**

The group reviewed a draft outline of an Educational Master Plan to guide the discussion.

Much of this discussion revolved around the environmental scan. Jerry Buckley reported that the District has one researcher trained in producing GIS maps, so we may be able to provide some illustrations for the environmental scan (and might be able to provide some online).

The group discussed the service area map in the existing environmental scan, and noted that we need to look at what the boundaries actually are; the service areas in the map are where the students actually come from, rather than the service boundary set by the state. There are relatively few students from the eastern parts of the district, which is why those areas don’t show up as service areas on the map. Members noted that the district has an Education Center in Viejas, and that Grossmont is the only college in the region with direct freeway access.

Members noted that the state definition of service area is about where you can advertise, not where students can go. With catalogs available online, it doesn’t really matter as much anymore.

Questions raised:

* Who defines the service area for the two colleges? The district or the state?
* Is this map adequate for our planning? If planning is done by official service area yet many students come from outside the service area, are we planning adequately?
* What is each college’s service area? How well are those people served? Who do we want to serve, and from where? Where do each college’s current students come from?
* Should we look outside the district boundaries as part of our planning? The regional CTE group does regional planning to avoid duplication.

The group concluded that planning should look at both the region and the GCCCD boundary, since we are drawing students from all over the region.

Looking at underserved populations – can we look at how many students graduate from high school but don’t go on to college? Must define underserved – EEO definitions and criteria for underserved tends to result in white, Caucasian students being identified as underserved, not traditionally *underrepresented* low income and minority students.

Achievement gaps – do we want to look at populations from the local high schools?

The group discussed Mission Grossmont and the PIE graphic, which is simple, easy to remember and printed on business cards – so people know what it is (good for accreditation). Cuyamaca does not have this kind of easy-to-remember mission statement.

Programs and Services section of EMP: want summaries, the final conclusions of each, but not the detail.

Want to keep the EMP short enough to be readily digestible by the district communities.

Group members may search the Internet to find other institution’s Educational Master Plans to see what they like and don’t like about them, what they would want to add to the outline reviewed.

**Discussion: Process to Develop the Educational Master Plan**

Members noted that in its Strategic Plan Grossmont did an in-depth analysis in the five focus areas approved by the Governing Board (Student access; Learning and student success; Fiscal and physical resources; Economic and community development; Value and support of employees). The group noted that organizing the EMP around these five areas might help everyone focus on what they need across programs, not just needs internal to each program.

Cuyamaca College’s Strategic Plan 2010-2016 also aligns with the five foci. The group noted that they were not sure how closely these foci are related back to the district and college core values in the three strategic plans (district and colleges).

The group discussed the Scan team process, summarized below:

Form teams across the two colleges (and Viejas Ed Center? How many people are there?); identify a leader for each team. Need to define a few core areas to look at; in the Grossmont College Strategic Plan they looked at the following:

* Political and economic trends
* Education and competition
* Energy and transportation
* Technology

Scan teams included experts from various areas; they scanned media, internet resources to identify trends. The Scan teams obtained information from faculty on campus, who also talked about trends. Teams had administration representatives, faculty, experts in the field, and a task force leader who put the data into the template. Each team met monthly to review, try to identify themes; then summarized their findings. Scan team analysis could be part of the EMP appendices.

Focus of the Educational Master Plan: Trend analysis is a chance to look into the future; the environmental scan is looking at the past. The EMP must emphasize the long-term, bigger picture; it is not as specific as the strategic plan. The group agreed that we need to think of an analogy for the planning process, such as planning for home ownership, to help explain it to the district faculty, staff and community.

Maybe we should add community/student panels to this Scan Team process if we can pull them off. Could be cross-district; college the information in a single place.

Might have opportunity for classified staff to work on the scans the first Monday of spring break, which is classified appreciation day.

Questions that were raised:

* Should community members be part of the scan teams? Or should the scan teams invite their own panels, or do interviews?
* Should we invite Board members to provide input to the scan teams, based on their role in the community (not their role as a Board member – need to get Cindy’s take on this).
* Who would lead the scan teams? Certain Grossmont administrators were creatively involved and led the teams.

The group agreed that once the scans are complete, we need to do College-wide/districtwide brainstorming on where to be in 10-20 years. We could then take the input from that brainstorming and do a retreat to set goals and objectives. This would then be sent out for the first wave of collegial review.

**Discussion: Timeline for the EMP development process**

August convocations – have to have parameters, set of worksheets with facilitators, so we end up with the best product possible.

Bring sections of the EMP to the Senates for collegial review as they are ready – not the whole EMP at once.

The draft timeline developed is included in the email attachments.

**Discussion: Membership of Steering Committee, roles and responsibilities**

The group agreed that most of the planning and input collection needs to be done by district/College folks, including leading the Scan teams and facilitating brainstorming sessions.

The group also started to discuss the development of graphics for the planning process, and how we might do this (who is expert at the districts/colleges?)

**Next steps:**

Phyllis Sensenig will summarize the results of the meeting, put the timeline and list of plans together, and send them to the Steering Committee members for review.

The Steering Committee will meet again at Cuyamaca College before the 2/11 DCEC meeting. We will schedule the next meeting via email.