

STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Summary of Meeting of Communications Council
November 30, 2010

Present Deborah G. Blue, Chris Villa, Ernie Garcia, Barbara Hioco, Terry Kershaw, Lacy Barnes, Randy Rowe, Bill Turini, Teresa Patterson, Nina Acosta, Melanie Highfill, Robert Fox, Don Lopez, Brian Speece, Shelly Conner,

Absent Jason Meyers, Cynthia Azari, Tony Capetillo

Review of Meeting Agenda and Check-in Mr. Turini – Reedley College Academic Senate held elections for officers. The results were: Bill Turini, President; Stephanie Curry, V.P.; Pam Gilmore, V.P.; Lee Brown, State representative ; Tom Mester, past president; Joe Libby, North Center representative

Dr. Hioco – Will be attending the follow-up meeting to the Degree Completion Summit at the Los Banos campus of Merced College.

Ms. DeKruif requested Council add AR 3435 and 5530 to the agenda. The timeframes for the AR's need clarification. Dr. Blue stated this item will be added to the next Communication Council agenda.

Ms. Highfill asked if a winner was declared for Board of Trustee Area IV. Dr. Blue stated the election has not been certified. She expected an announcement from the County Registrar's Office by the end of the day.

Review of Board Meeting Agenda for December 7, 2010 Council reviewed the agenda. Dr. Blue stated that under general item 10-66, Consideration to Accept 2009-2010 Audit Report, there was one citation by the auditors involving student permission forms for concurrent enrollment. The issue was corrected.

Administrative Regulation 5030 Mr. Fox presented information on AR 5030. He stated the vice presidents recommend AR 5030 be modified in order to exempt the health and enrollment fees for students participating in the high school dual enrollment program, in accordance with Ed Code section 76001, and consistent with our practice.

Dr. Hioco stated the Board of Trustees took action two years ago to eliminate enrollment fees for high school students.

The consensus of the Council was to proceed with the formal review process.

Organizational review update Mr. Fox provided an update of the Organizational Review project. Interviews have been conducted and surveys completed. Over 500 hundred survey responses have been received. The summary of the survey is expected to be complete by the end of the week.

District Dr. Blue asked Council for comments on the draft document:

Educational
Master Plan –
revised draft

Dr. Kershaw stated he liked the external scans, which explains what the District is all about.

Dr. Patterson referred to page 39 of the document, “Total Cost of Ownership”. She stated it referenced a District process that did not take place.

Mr. Turini is concerned about educational institutions becoming “degree mills.” He said he was disappointed with the overall quality of the document. He cited page 22 of the document as a “boiler plate” of information regarding an economic overview.

Mr. Lopez asked the question, “Who is the audience and what is the purpose of this document?” Dr. Blue replied the audience consists of ourselves. In part, it is the basis for a Facilities Master Plan. Mr. Speece stated that with regards to the Facilities Master Plan, the District gets a better idea of projects from the individual campuses.

Ms. DeKruif noted the status of the Southeast Center is ambiguous in this document. She also stated there should be a mention of the Organizational Review.

Dr. Villa said the FCC Strategic Planning Council reviewed the draft and was concerned the Southeast Center was not mentioned.

Mr. Lopez referenced page 22 of the document and recommended staff to be cautious of those kinds of statistics and assumptions.

The Council identified the following positives and negatives of the Draft:

<u>Positives</u>	<u>Negatives</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to Strategic Master Plan as a reference point in all planning documents • Internal/External Scan demographics • District in relationship to local region • Recommendation #4 unresolved • The scan data should provide the information the Board can use to make decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total cost of ownership • District process did not take place • Lack of writing and editing • Boiler plate economic overview • Inadequate data points on District in relationship to the nation • Absence of student achievement data • Lack of relationships between data and narrative with recommendations

District

Examples of Functional Plans

Educational
Master Plan –
revised draft

- Ed Master Plans
- Enrollment management plans
- Technology plans

Optional Next Steps

- Incorporate the information into the strategic plan
- Do not need a District Educational Master Plan
- Need a districtwide planning body
- Strategic (education) Plan
- Strategic Plan must address District as a whole and by sites
- Comprehensive/map our plans

Recommendations

- Need to be addressed
- There are decisions points for the Board
- Incorporate Organizational Review findings, as appropriate
- 4,9,11 – Facilities Master Plan

Dr. Blue asked for recommended next steps. Dr. Patterson said to take the current information referencing the strategic master plan and use it in all planning documents. The Facilities Master Plan could address the needs of each campus.

Dr. Blue recommended updating the District Strategic Plan and get on the same timelines as the colleges. Demographic data should also be added, establishing a relationship to the communities we serve.

The consensus of the Council was to take the information and include it in the District Strategic Plan.

Mr. Lopez said he was concerned about the Facilities Master Plan in relationship to the timelines. Mr. Speece stated there are no new initial project proposals in process.

Dr. Hioco stated the campuses need to wait until the District plan is updated. Dr. Blue stated Jothany Blackwood is creating a crosswalk between the campuses and the District. She is also reviewing other models.

College and
District
Governance
Structures and
Processes

Dr. Blue noted the District does not have a separate strategic planning committee.

One of the issues on the campuses is the lack of researchers. This item will be placed on the next agenda for further discussion

Communications

Dr. Blue stated there are difficult discussions going on across the District and

Council Retreat
Date and reading
material

the campuses. She asked the Council how things were going. Dr. Villa said communication needs to be better. Dr. Hioco stated staff is feeling overwhelmed; and Ms. Barnes said she is concerned the Board believes that “everything is rosy”. She believes morale is very bad and there is a sense of disengagement. Dr. Blue stated there needs to be a re-evaluation of how to negotiate. She is recommending a facilitated retreat. The Council looked at dates in January and decided on January 28, 2011. Dr. Blue asked staff to think about who else should attend. She distributed the book, “Getting to Yes” to Council and asked them to read it in preparation for the retreat.

Around the
Table and
Check-Outs

Dr. Blue discussed the 2020 Vision resolution. She requested Council take a look at it before it goes to the Board. This item will be on the next agenda.

Ms. Barnes questioned what the responsibility of the Board of Trustees is in relationship to the District and its employees. She asked if the District team should be bigger, rather than smaller.

Dr. Patterson stated she is attending the National Higher Education Government Relations Conference in Austin Texas later this week.

Dr. Villa stated FCC staff will begin to move into the OAB on December 13, 2010.

Future Agenda
Items

1. District Budget Development and Allocation Process
2. Crosswalk of College and District Strategic Plans
3. Reports and Board of Trustee Meetings
4. District responses to Accreditation Standards and the Policy and procedures for the evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi Unit systems

Next Meeting

The next Communications Council meeting is scheduled for January 4, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at Reedley College, Student Center Lounge.