

Strategic Planning/Accreditation Joint meeting  
Notes  
2/26/2015

Members in attendance: James Kawahara, Amanda Ryan Romo\*, Jose Ramirez, Alex Immerblum\*, Carol Kozeracki, Vi Ly, Abel Rodriguez, Ann Tomlison, Angelica Toledo, Alfred Gallegos, Julie Benavides, Danelle Fallert, Richard Moyer, Jeff Hernandez\*, Paul De La Certa, Joan Lang.

\*partial attendance of the meeting

It should be noted that a quorum for Strategic Planning was not met and thus no actions could officially be made. Comments reflect a consensus of the group.

- I. Call to Order at 12:15
- II. Adoption of the agenda
- III. Review of "Notes from 1/20/2015"
- IV. Consensus was reached on the following items.
  - a. Adoption of Mission Statement with edits from 1/20/2015. It was generally agreed to move the proposed changes of the Mission Statement along to ESGC, Academic Senate and ASU according to the Governance Handbook.
  - b. A discussion regarding adoption of the planning timeline made a few minor adjustments including:
    - i. Moving the site visit from spring 2024 to spring 2023.
    - ii. Concern that reviewing the mission statement every year may be too much, although reviewing the mission statement every 7 years was too long. Perhaps a check-in mid way would be ideal.
    - iii. The dates of the Mission Statement Revision should be added to the Planning Calendar.
  - c. A. Gallegos led a brief discussion about handouts on Student Achievement Data and college Benchmarks. Some questions over how the numbers were derived and how these would be incorporated into the college's and district's planning processes were raised.
  - d. SPC membership was not settled because quorum was not reached. Since this is the third meeting of SPC this year and none of them have made quorum, a lengthier discussion about the SPC needs to be considered. A suggestion about making SPC a workgroup of ESGC was voiced. The inability to meet quorum only accentuates the need to re-examine membership however the lack of quorum also blocks the ability of the committee to move on this issue. Concern about "over-governance", too many committees, the same people on every committee and spending too much time on committee structure versus on the tasks of the committee and fulfillment of the mission of

the college were voiced. One member did not agree that this was a problem. A suggestion was made to focus on governance structure as part of the Quality Essay for the accreditation report

- e. Update SGH
  - i. Mission Statement (see above – Pg. 1)
  - ii. Organizational Structure (Carol – pg 8-18)
  - iii. Strategic Planning Committee ( Alfred pg. 26) There is a need to revise this but inability to do so because the committee has not meet quorum all year.
  - iv. ESGC will review at their March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting (pg. 19, 20)
  - v. Educational Planning Subcommittee provided language with some changes. It was agreed that Carol and Alex will revise and bring back a clean copy for the committee.
  - vi. Ann agreed to look over the language for the Facilities Planning Subcommittee pg. 28 .
  - vii. Technology Planning Subcommittee – no changes
  - viii. A draft of revisions of the Program Review and Viability Committee was presented. Since this was just presented to the committee a second reading of the document should occure(pg. 29 )
  - ix. Budget Pg. 31-35 – completed
  - x. No report regarding the Faculty Hiring Prioritization was given. (Kerrin pg 35-36)
  - xi. Much discussion regarding the Human Resource Committee proposed language for the Governance Policy Handbook occurred.
    - 1. The title should read Classified (Staff) Hiring Prioritization.
    - 2. This section is new and since this process has not been fully implemented it is difficult to describe. Several of the kinks in the process are yet to be worked out completely. It was noted that the place to discuss implementation of the HRP should not be in Accreditation and that this wider discussion of the role of HRC and its implementation should be elsewhere.
    - 3. There was concern that the language should match that in the HRC Policy.
    - 4. There was concern raised that the categorical funds should not be required to be vetted through the HRC committee because of the timeliness of distribution of funds and the importance of needing to spend funds otherwise the state would reduce the funding.
    - 5. Ann agreed to review the document and provide suggestions for or next meeting
  - xii. No language was provided to update the Equipment Prioritization and Allocation pg. 36 (??)

- xiii. No language was provided to update the External Grants (pg. 38). John Rude has agreed to revise this
- xiv. Revisions of Curriculum Development pg. 39 were approved
- xv. No language was provided to update Student Leadership and Involvement pg. 41. Danelle agreed to work with Sonia regarding this.
- xvi. Revisions of Accreditation pg. 41 were approved
- xvii. No language was provided to update Work Environment pg. 40
- xviii. No language was provided to update Student Success and Basic Skills pg. 40
- xix. Amanda had provided updates for Student Learning Outcomes (Learning Assessment Committee) pg. 40 but these handouts were not available at the meeting and the meeting ran out of time.
- xx. Evaluation – Program Review pg. 43-56 (Alfred/Jeff)
- xxi. Evaluation – SLOs pg. 57 (Amanda) see above # xix.
- xxii. Evaluation – Accreditation pg. 58 (Barb) see above # xvi.

Some general comments about revisions to the Governance Policy Handbook were addressed:

1. Individuals were encouraged to revise their sections.
2. If no revisions are brought forward before the end of March, 2015, the Accreditation Steering Committee should assume that none are needed.
3. One additional meeting in March needs to be scheduled in order to meet our March 30 deadline for the Governance Policy Handbook. A poll for availability will be circulated.

**NOTE\* All edits need to be finalized by March 30**