

COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, March 15, 2016
3:30 – 4:30 pm – DLC 4/Yreka 5

PC Members

- ✓ Josh Collins
Vickie Donaldson, Meeting Recorder
- ✓ Eric Houck
- ✓ Steve Reynolds
- ✓ Bart Scott
- ✓ Todd Scott
- ✓ Patrice Thatcher
- ✓ Mike Tischler
Alison Varty (Sabbatical)
- ✓ Calvin Wagner
- ✓ Stephanie Wroten

MINUTES

1. **Discussion – Accreditation Visit Review (15 Min)**

Planning-wise, the Accreditation team recommends updating the Planning by Design document – that is already underway. Overall, there were no surprises that came out of the accreditation exit interview. Next steps are:

- we will receive the draft report from the team chair and we will review it for corrections of fact
- once we send it back with corrections then the entire report gets sent to the Commission
- the Commission will have their meeting at the end of June to take action on the college
- once they take action we then receive the official action letter
- we then need to take action on their recommendations
- some items are already in progress

2. **Discussion – Implementation of IMP (35 Min)**

Over the remainder of this semester the Planning by Design taskforce will begin working on revising the document. The College will need to begin to implement the plans and then we will begin to see progress in our target areas. Eric pulled the old forms for the committee to review. The committee will need to determine what we want to track on the new forms. The DL committee is using a form that tracks strategy, objectives/goals, and who is responsible for the work. There has been discussion about integrating the PR and IMP. If we do so we must add elements that are useful for PR.

- On the non-instructional PRs the budget piece is missing.

- The campus needs to learn to use the same language/similar vocabulary when talking about issues.
- The old IMP did not lend itself well to multiple year tracking, and it was overwhelming. People didn't know what was expected and what they had to fill out. Everyone handled it differently. Some people did a good job, and some did not. The form was later revised, but there is still room for improvement. It's especially important to be able to track over multiple years. The high turnover rate in departments has not helped either.
- Todd's old college used a form that worked well. The 1st column = Goal, 2nd column = Objective for meeting goal, 3rd column = Strategies, 4th column = Performance measure/target, and 5th column = who's responsible. Form is web based so that the bodies of oversight can fill it out every year and track progress. This helps everyone adhere to a timeline. The results of PR are incorporated into the document. Everything was prioritized. The requests for resources from PRs were looked at to see how they fit in with the priorities of the institution. Strategies can be changed every year. The oversight body was the Enrollment Management team. Committees recommend, but the person in authority is the one accountable for getting the goals completed. The strategies were developed at the committee level or responsible party. The goals and objectives were done in Planning Committee. Sometimes there were multiple committees/people for oversight.
- Todd likes the idea of prioritizing items in the master plan and using that to focus our resources. This document would make it easy to track strategic targets. Does this body want to check to make sure there is progress? Or should that responsibility fall elsewhere? The oversight bodies might be a VP. We will assign a point position, rather than point person, due to turnovers. We will need to know if targets are abandoned or more resources are needed or if the target is completed. These should be broken up by year 1, year 2, etc.
- Next steps, Todd will come up with a document like the one from L.A City College. Eric will also work on a form and input our information into this form. The form should be a fillable pdf. It will be similar to the academic PR. The plan needs to include a reasonable amount of objectives and/or strategies. But when there is more than one strategy, it's hard to tell which one worked. Directions need to be specific, so people know what is expected. Plans will eventually go to College Council for approval.

3. **Discussion – Report from Planning by Design Revision Taskforce (10 Min)**

Nancy Funk is working on the timeline. Bart is trying to find out why some dates were chosen. Rob wrote the last Planning by Design document and Kristie added some forms. There are large portions that should be revised. The practical parts on how it works need to be defined. After it's revised it will come back here for input.

4. **Other**

- Is there a timeline for adding to this committee? The structure is lacking. There is not an operating document for the Planning Committee, just what the original charge of the committee was. This committee is a shared governance committee that reports to College Council? But there is no report from this group at the College Council meetings. This committee was formed after the Budget Committee. The governance structure needs to be addressed as per the accreditation visit. The restructure of this committee will most likely be done next fall. Todd wants to add a VP and the Academic Senate as co-chairs. Planning committee thinks this is appropriate.
- Talked about a new name for the Planning by Design document.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 PM.