

COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, September 2, 2015
3:00 – 4:00 – DLC 4/Yreka Campus 5

PC Members

- ✓ Josh Collins
- ✓ Eric Houck
- ✓ Steve Reynolds
- ✓ Bart Scott
- Patrice Thatcher
- Scotty Thomason
- ✓ Mike Tischler
- Alison Varty (Sabbatical 2015-16)
- ✓ Stephanie Wroten
- ✓ Sheila Grimes, Recording Secretary

MINUTES

1. **Minutes**

Minutes not available

2. **Discussion – EMP Draft Feedback (45 Min)**

Based on last week's discussion, Eric made the following changes to the Educational Master Plan:

- **Institutional**~~Educational~~ Master Plan (**I**EMP)
 - The Committee recommended changing the name of the Master Plan from Educational to Institutional so that this document would encompass planning efforts from all of the different areas. Educational implies focus on the Instructional and Student Services areas only.
- **Strategic Target** ~~Goal~~
 - The Committee recommended changing goal to strategic target.

The Planning by Design document is intended to be the Administrative Procedure for planning. Periodically, we create a plan following the process outlined in the Planning by Design document.

In his visits to other campuses, Steve observed that the colleges have an Institutional Master Plan which is very brief and contains institutional goal and each division within the college applies these goals to their areas.

In previous years, various departments on campus (i.e., Financial Aid, Human Resources, etc.) completed an annual non-program review of their areas based on the EMP. These plans contained elements of program review. The prior year's plans were evaluated based on what was accomplished and what still needed to be done. After which, new goals/plans were added for the upcoming year.

It was decided that when the Committee creates an annual planning form, there will be a place to check "yes" if the proposed plans aligns with Strategic Target 1, 2, or 3 of the IMP. Each area will be asked to develop their measurable objectives and track the data.

It was discussed that we need to decide on what data source the College should use to track information. Once decided, this source needs to be used consistently throughout the college.

2. **Discussion – EMP Draft Feedback (45 Min) – (Con’d)**

Next steps:

Eric would like the Committee to review the IMP draft and clarify and refine the various sections for each Strategic Target and be prepared to discuss their revisions at next week’s meeting.

Here are some considerations to take into account:

- **Strategic Target**
 - Does it represent/reflect everything we intended with the underlying “theme” we’d discussed?
 - Is it concisely worded?
 - Does it tie correctly to the Institutional Goals?
- **Description** (Here we can expand on the strategic target.)
 - Does it communicate the essence of the strategic target clearly?
 - What’s missing?
- **Measurable Objectives**
 - What are 1-3 ways we can measure whether we hit the target?
 - Does data exist for this measurement yet?
 - How can we improve the suggested measures?
 - Combine any?
 - Remove any?
- **Recommended Strategies**
 - What are the practical ways areas of the college may implement this strategic target?
 - Does it mesh with the ideas from Spring 15 planning day?

3. **Discussion – Timeline in Prep for Planning Day (15 Min)**

Eric would like to distribute the IMP to the campus on Planning Day to review. In the Planning Committee’s presentation to the Campus, he would like to talk about how the Committee arrived at the current draft of the IMP and how the Campus can apply the IMP to their areas. Eric suggested having breakout sessions for groups to review their areas. He would also like to give the Campus the opportunity to provide feedback on this document.

4. **Other**

Mike Tischler suggested putting together a student focus group to review the IMP and ask them questions such as:

- What barriers do students see?
- How can we help you as a student?

Bart continues to work on the Environmental Scan piece.

The Committee would like to see an additional administrator, perhaps a vice president, join the group.

Steve commented that the Accreditation Steering Committee has been trying to determine what the two or three areas of focus should be for our Quality Focus Essay. This document is to specify the plans we have for institutional improvement. Steve wanted to be sure that the Quality Focus Essay is going in the same direction as the IMP. Problem areas which have surfaced in the self-study that will be included in the Quality Focus Essay are data quality, streamlining processes (issues with the SLO collection), and institutional evaluation (non-program review and governance committees are not being evaluated).

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.