

DRAFT

STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL

MINUTES

April 27, 2007

1. **Minutes from the March 23 meeting** of the Strategic Planning Council were approved as submitted. (M/S: Lubin/Poole; unanimous.)
2. Discussion of the question of **digital recording formats for SPC meetings** was postponed.
3. Jan Lubin presented a **report from the ad hoc Distance Education Committee** and summarized its key points, as follows:
 - a) DE sections of the Strategic Plan were revised and updated. These emphasize the high priority of support for DE at HCC through the funding of additional APT positions for Media and Web Specialists.
 - b) The DE Committee plans to create a handbook for the college. In the meantime, Jon Blumhardt has posted information on “best practices” on the DE intranet site under the DE ad hoc link.
 - c) The committee will continue to work on issues relating to ADA compliance, and will identify resources for DE faculty in this context.
 - d) In addition to the APT positions noted above, it will be important to identify and acquire other resources needed to meet the needs of students enrolled in DE courses. This will result in further recommendations for the Strategic Plan
 - e) The ad hoc DE committee recommends that the FSEC establish a permanent Distance Education Advisory Board to ensure effective coordination of this program that involves the efforts of several units on campus. DE coordinator Jan Petersen will present a proposal and charter to the FSEC in Fall 2007.

It was noted that as DE is institutionalized, it will be important to ensure a productive interface between the proposed DE Advisory Board and the Committee on Programs and Curricula (CPC).

4a. **Strategic Plan Update / Cycle for Review:** Chair Vern Takebayashi distributed a revised flow chart for the Strategic Plan Cycle for discussion. It was noted that one of the results of the proposed modification is that fewer things will reach the level of administrative review, but those that do will have clear buy-in. Sam Rhoads suggested some changes in the sequence to ensure more opportunities for input from the campus community; Brian Furuto suggested that a form be developed for use in submitting ideas for consideration for the Strategic Plan; Jerry Cerny questioned how/when proposals would be posted for review and then added to the Strategic Plan. Vern will continue to work on this flow chart.

4b. Vern Takebayashi also distributed an **updated Strategic Plan document** coded to reflect the result of administrative review and prioritization. Items are either recommended for the 2007-08 Strategic Plan, already funded, currently being done, or not recommended at this time. The Planning Council will need to review these recommendations and establish final priorities before

the end of May, while Division Chairs are still on duty. Jerry Cerny noted that the SPC should consider how our priorities are aligned with the “Second Decade” document (he will send that to SPC members) and Vern also noted that HCC should consider alignment with the UH system plan as well. Special SPC sessions to work on this were set for May 16 and 17.

5. The question of subsequent **meeting times during the summer period** was deferred. Vern noted that some work can be conducted online, and Bill Becker noted that after the conversion from Web CT to Sakai (in June) that system can be used to support communication. Bill asked for the UH ID names of SPC members in order to set up a new listserv for the SPC.

6. Vern Takebayashi distributed two handouts relating to **Accreditation Recommendation #2** (linking assessment, program reviews and institutional effectiveness) which in turn has direct bearing on the development and review of the Strategic Plan. We need to begin a discussion of this that will also encourage buy-in to assessment efforts in general.

In the “HCC Statement on the **Role of Assessment in the Strategic Planning Process**” the linkage between assessment results, items in the Strategic Plan and budget requests is made explicit. While assessment is one of the main engines driving budget requests, specific qualifications linked to the general statement of principle make clear that demonstration of need alone is not sufficient to ensure inclusion of an item in the Strategic Plan or campus budget. Requesters must present a clear rationale for inclusion, identify consequences of not funding a request, and show that resources requested are cost-effective.

This item occasioned substantial discussion, which will need to be ongoing as we gain more understanding of assessment and more experience in “closing the loop” that links assessment and planning. Key questions/comments include the following:

- a) What constitutes appropriate/effective “evidence” and how should it be presented?
- b) Planning needs to be linked to annual assessment and five-year program review.
- c) Accommodation needs to be made for faculty/staff who are still learning how to connect assessment results and the planning process.
- d) What can be done to allow room for new or innovative proposals that have strong potential but no track record?
- e) In the case of potential rather than proven value, forecasting can be effective, particularly if workforce data are available.
- f) What should be done about special initiatives that come initially with external sources of funding but may need to be institutionalized later on?
- g) Should such (initially) “no cost” items be put in the Strategic Plan, or simply tracked until the time arrives when institutional commitment is required? (Note: the discussion suggested a consensus that it would be better to include such items as “place holders” in the SP so as not to lose sight of them.)
- h) What criteria should be established by which to assess such “no cost” items so that the college can, when necessary, validate the success and future viability of the program or decide on a reasonable “exit strategy”?

Ross Egloria also discussed at greater length the link between assessment and planning and suggested the creation of a basic template that programs could use to identify items for the SP and

include cost, justification and evidence. It was also suggested that the initiator of the request should be identified, so that someone is clearly accountable and/or could be contacted if questions arise. Ross suggested that this would be helpful also to ensure that he can provide assistance. He will work in this in Fall 2007 with the Assessment Committee.

Vern Takebayashi also shared with the SPC a summary of the “brainstorming” portion of the March 23 meeting that addressed, among other things, the need for ways to train faculty to understand and implement the assessment/planning process. Ross suggested that we could begin with “brown bag” sessions in the fall and that while there may continue to be some resistance, faculty need to learn that assessment is not going to go away and therefore needs to be used effectively.

Marcia Roberts-Deutsch
Recorder