

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PRESIDENT'S CABINET RETREAT
MISSION TRAILS REGIONAL PARK
APRIL 24, 2009**

MINUTES

The Retreat began at 9:20 am.

ITEM	Person Responsible	Time
<p>Coffee/Introductions ICE BREAKER</p> <p>Terrie Teegarden introduced an ice breaker. Everyone was asked to line up according to birthday without speaking. Then, they were separated into groups according to their birthdays.</p> <p>An activity ensued using colored blocks. Each group received cards with instructions that they were allowed to read but not show one another. Then, they verbally gave these instructions to each other. The goal was to correctly build the blocks according to the instructions. The winning group received a prize.</p>	Terrie T.	9:00-9:20
<p>Goals for the Meeting/Review of Agenda</p> <p>Rita Cepeda reviewed the goals for the meeting:</p> <p>1. To create a community of learners that comes together in support of "Institutional Excellence."</p> <p>Cepeda stressed the importance of community. We share areas of expertise. We share goals as a community – those common goals and personal goals. Individuals shared examples of "community"; the knowledge that people are available to support you. We share an identity. We share a "healthy" community – one that can share and discuss issues. We are always learning. It's about improving the community in which we are a part. Effectiveness and Efficiency – an organization can be very efficient using various tools – but being effective comes from the ability to work through "chaos". A community is as simple as having a conversation with people we meet. Mesa was described as "the little Harvard of Community Colleges".</p>	Rita C.	9:20- 9:35

1. To create a community of learners that comes together in support of “Institutional Excellence.” (continued)

The limits of community can be defined in various ways. Who is a member of Mesa? It could be all those who receive a paycheck from Mesa but if you look at who is really involved – it is a smaller subset of individuals. The extent of involvement by “everyone” was discussed. For example, involving adjuncts, who work at various campuses, would make the community stronger. We are working to serve the broader San Diego community.

Cepeda noted a previous discussion with Sebastian Law, where he asked “What is the seed?” She continued with additional questions: Where does it start? How do we engage the broader community? Why do we belong as members of this community? What is our mission, vision, values?

She noted the recent science fair and expansion beyond the footprint of the campus.

In addition, Cepeda discussed the transition from “Junior” to “Community” college as a way to be responsive to the needs of the community. This makes us a great American invention.

She provided parking as an example of the change in attitude from students after the parking structure was built. Our physical campus has changed and our students change with it. Citing a conference she attended, this is the “iPod” generation. We have to consider making changes to adapt and use tools to make things easier.

Cepeda asked: What have we done over the past four years to identify ourselves? Where are we right now and where do we need to be?

An Accreditation Update document was referenced. Cepeda noted every year the Mission Statement must be updated. As we have evolved in the notion of clarity and simplicity, we must ask if everyone knows Mesa’s mission. If the answer continues to be “no”, we need to get the word out.

<p>2. To identify the practical tools to be used by this community of learners in order to advance the work of the college.</p> <p>This item was discussed under the first goal above.</p>		
<p>Mesa’s Strategic Planning Process: Assessment of Current Progress</p> <p>Cepeda asked: What comes first – accreditation or strategic planning? They are all interrelated but the starting point is to be clear about our values – our vision. Regarding Mesa’s budget decisions, we need to be able to say with certainty why each area was funded as such.</p> <p>In addition, she noted previous discussions on this topic and asked: How do we know what improvements to make, how do we know if we arrived, how do we measure it? We have made some steps toward that end.</p> <p>Cepeda asked: Where do we need to be for accreditation? An Accreditation Update handout was referenced, specifically the chart on the last page. Yvonne Bergland noted Mesa needs to be at “sustainable continuous quality improvement”. Discussion followed and most agreed Mesa is at the beginning of the third level, “proficiency”.</p> <p>William Craft noted that we have a lot of good reasons to reach that fourth level and the team is expecting to see we corrected areas where recommendations were made during the previous site visit.</p> <p>Cepeda noted the reason one of the reasons the Accrediting Commission has imposed such “sanctions”. Prior to 2001, the Commission noted some colleges were not paying attention to recommendations. It was decided to impose sanctions so colleges would follow through with recommendations. She noted certain issues with continuous improvement. There is a two-year rule. If there is a “finding” made by the Commission, and it is not been met by the next visit, the Commission issues a two-year letter indicating we must achieve the specified level. Cepeda indicated we must take note of the climate of accreditation and at the same time be true to our values and our students as well as be able to measure our progress. We as a team need to make the best decisions using the resources we have currently.</p>	<p>Rita C.</p>	<p>9:35-10:00</p>

BREAK	10:40--10:55	
<p>Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:</p> <p>a) Vision/Mission/Values (Jonathan Fohrman)</p> <p>Jonathan Fohrman presented a “Planting the Seed” PowerPoint. He noted the strategic planning framework was approved. The terms “Our Vision”; “Our Mission”, “Our Values” were defined. He explained the notion of the community colleges as a “democracy” was one reason why he chose to work at a community college after returning from overseas.</p> <p>He noted previous discussion last summer when the lengthy statement was condensed into the information on the slide: “Our Vision” – what we strive to be; “Our Mission” – why we exist; “Our Values” – what we believe in. It is a continuous process that is always evolving. To that end, he presented suggestions for the vision, mission, and values, noting that this was a group effort as a result of last year’s discussion.</p> <p>Craft noted we have three types of students: Those who struggled in high school; those who did not struggle but can’t afford college; and continuing education students who want to learn more. He suggested the mission statement include these three groups in our community. Paul Sykes noted a fourth group – those students who are being retraining for a new career.</p> <p>Suggestions were made by Terrie Teegarden and Charlie Zappia to add “foster scholarship, leadership, personal growth and responsibility”; and enable student success “through learning”....Bergland added that once this statement is written, it needs to be measureable.</p> <p>Cepeda asked: Are all of our students reflected? Are these measureable? Is it reflective of the community college mission statement as defined in the Education Code; the Academic, Vocational; basic skills/continuing education; economic growth; and the global economy?</p> <p>Craft suggested having a one-pager containing this information that may be posted in a visible location for students to see.</p> <p>Joi Blake added that this should be a “living document”.</p>	<p>Jonathan F. Barbara K. Larry W. Yvonne B.</p>	<p>10:00-10:40 11:00 – 12:00</p>

Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:

**a) Vision/Mission/Values (Jonathan Fohrman)
(continued)**

Lina Heil suggested that this document be tailored for each area – i.e. the LRC document would be different than that for her area as the P.I.O. Cepeda noted the approval process that needs to be followed for this type of revision.

Fohrman described a list of values: community, success, access, equity, responsiveness, quality, diversity, integrity, respect, accountability. Cepeda noted that “sustainability” has been added to this list. Teegarden suggested adding “learning”, “teaching”, and “scholarship”.

b) Strategic Planning Model (Barbara Kavalier)

Barbara Kavalier presented a PowerPoint on the strategic planning framework. She described a flowchart that was presented at a previous President’s Cabinet. She then deconstructed the model to explain how the pieces fit.

Kavalier indicated everything starts with who we are, where we want to go, and what we value – that is at the center. The next piece has to do with performance indicators. In the model, there are certain expectations that need to be met – retention/ success, persistence, access, satisfaction rate, and graduation rate.

Then, we need to assess where we are – Basic Skills data, ARCC data, high school data, CCSSE data – active and collaborative data, for example. We need to note where the gaps are in order to move forward. She suggested review of state-level data; district data – the environmental scan, focus groups with employers. Then, identify college strategic goals. For example, a college goal to increase the retention and success of basic skills students, etc. The department and program plans would also be included.

Next, develop implementation strategies and align departments with college-wide plans. Finally, at the end of the year, evaluate if we made a difference with these activities and strategies.

Cepeda reminded the group that “We Measure what we Treasure”.

Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:

**b) Strategic Planning Model (Barbara Kavalier)
(continued)**

Kavalier explained a flowchart containing an example of how the model would look with all the pieces she described.

Discussion followed regarding the meaning of the numbers. Susan Mun explained “success rate” using a formula.

Cepeda added defining the criteria is the bigger issue: What are the measurements and are they appropriately defined? She noted the importance of informed decision-making.

Teegarden added that state-wide data contains information about students from census. She described the method used by the Math department to determine SLOs.

Discussion followed as to how the goals are determined. Cepeda explained the process, noting how decisions are made according to how they are tied to the goals of that area and the College. The goals could be “pie in the sky” but a determination should be made how to allocate funds.

Discussion continued based on the example given by Kavalier. Cepeda noted that if decisions are made to fund, or cut, etc., these decisions are usually made by committees or other individuals providing input leading to that decision.

The purpose of the model is to close the loop and link everything back to the goals.

c) Performance Indicators (Larry Weiss)

Larry Weiss provided an analogy between performance indicators and his experience as a wrestler in high school. He presented a PowerPoint describing how to assess where we are and where we are going. He indicated there were various reasons that affected his decision to leave wrestling behind but that decision opened his door to speech, debate and theater.

Discussion followed and the metaphor of a successful wrestling career is one performance indicator.

Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:

c) Performance Indicators (Larry Weiss) (continued)

Weiss focused on the strategic planning framework: definition of terms and why these are important. Performance indicators (how we assess effectiveness); identification of college strategic goals, development of plans, assessment of plans.

Weiss asked: Why performance indicators? At Mesa, currently we are not using any overarching indicators to report the success we are experiencing in reaching our College-wide goals. These performance indicators should be measurable, as well as aligned with state and national data for comparison, and tracked over time.

He provided examples of performance indicators: equity/ access, engagement/retention, persistence, success, institutional effectiveness.

He noted available data to gauge student success such as CCSSE, ARCC, Basic Skills data, and surveys.

He noted available data to gauge college success such as program review, surveys, and the environmental scan.

Discussion followed and Fohrman asked: If we take our geographical community, how can we assess our responsiveness to their needs?

Mun added the District solicited the services of a company to provide data of the most high demand occupations in San Diego. That information takes into account turn over. She suggested programs be offered that are responsive to these needs.

Cepeda asked: What does the College do proactively to assess the community? Examples used are advisory boards and enrollment data. Heil cited community events Mesa participates in but this type of data has not been collected.

Weiss added these examples are of community responsiveness but how do we collect data? Michael Reese indicated when VTEA funds are requested, industry experts are consulted to determine allocation of those funds. Charles Zappia noted it is a response to what is outside the parameters of this institution; find out what it should be and how to shape that.

Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:

c) Performance Indicators (Larry Weiss) (continued)

Cepeda asked: Where will the region be in ten years? Demographics and health care issues have been changing. Right now, we respond to what is happening and then look forward to see how we can make a difference in the future.

Weiss noted the goal is to obtain a “bigger picture” and respond to it.

d) Goals (Yvonne Bergland)

Yvonne Bergland presented a PowerPoint focusing on goals. She noted the “California Community Colleges: System Strategic Plan”. There are five major strategic initiatives and these are all supported by objectives.

Bergland reported last summer, she worked with a group that reviewed State and District goals. She reviewed the District strategic priorities, noting these have been revised and there are now a total of seven. She attempted to match these new priorities with Mesa’s and found that not all could be aligned. During the group activity, work will focus on matching both documents.

She explained a chart containing “district priorities” on the left hand side, “CCC System Goals” across the top and “Responding to changing educational needs and opportunities” at the bottom.

The group she had worked with identified four areas, noting the glue that held these areas together is the Mission Statement. There were twelve strategic planning priorities and within these there were a set of goals that refer to these priorities. These priorities should be reviewed. She suggested developing a plan that is overarching. Also, the intention was that those goals are evaluated each year and this type of review was not indicated in the Educational Master Plan.

In addition, when these goals are reviewed and evaluated, Bergland indicated that feedback as to the next steps was needed, based on the model, mission statement and performance indicators.

She asked: Why do we have performance indicators? We want to continuously measure our progress toward reaching our goals.

<p>Overview of Key Strategic Planning Components:</p> <p>d) Goals (Yvonne Bergland) (continued)</p> <p>She noted that the identification of College strategic goals should be based on assessment of performance indicators and an environmental scan.</p> <p>The last chart she described showed the relationship among the vision, mission, values, performance indicators and College goals.</p> <p>Cepeda asked: How closely is Mesa aligned with the state, District and College goals? We should be able to respond to these overarching goals – we want to meet and exceed them. Some goals may have meaning but are not aligned with overall goals.</p> <p>Cepeda asked: Do we have simplicity? Maybe we need to look at overarching goals that are simple, overarching and are responsive to vision, mission and values.</p> <p>The groups were assigned to each leader and area as follows: Kavalier for strategic planning, Fohrman for vision, Bergland for goals, and Weiss for performance indicators.</p>		
<p>LUNCH</p>		<p>12:00-1:00</p>
<p>Small Group Discussion/Group Activity:</p> <p>All four groups worked individually on each of these areas:</p> <p>Group 1 – Vision/Mission/Values Group 2 – Strategic Planning Model Group 3 - Performance Indicators Group 4 - Goals</p> <p>Small Group Reporting Out (5 minutes per group):</p> <p>Group 1 – Vision/Mission/Values</p> <p>Group 1 report: Fohrman reported on behalf of the group:</p> <p>Vision – “Mesa College is a positive force in our community that prepares our students to shape the future through education and service.”</p>	<p>Facilitators: Jonathan F. Barbara K. Larry W. Yvonne B.</p>	<p>10:55-11:55 1:00 – 2:00?</p>

Small Group Reporting Out (5 minutes per group):

Group 1 – Vision/Mission/Values

Group 1 report (continued): Teegarden suggested revising the vision to read: “Mesa College is a positive force in developing students to shape the future through education and service.”

Discussion follows that the word “develops” was preferred to the word “prepares”.

Discussion followed on the meaning of the word “service”. Fohrman explained that it has multiple meanings. Cepeda added some meanings are applied academics, and service learning.

Margie Fritch suggested revising it to read “Mesa College shapes the future”.

Ashanti Hands suggested revising it to read: “A positive force shaping our future through education and service” or “Helping each individual student succeed.”

Weiss suggested “Mesa Makes a Difference”.

Law suggested revising it to read “Mesa College shapes the future one student at a time.”

Cepeda added while attending a recent conference that there is a language of communicating with the iPod generation. In addition, the conference focused on how to merge the idea of scholarship and literacy and the ability to communicate with your audience.

It was suggested to consult with the campus community on what speaks to them. Craft suggested doing so during the summer and offer an incentive such as a free bottle of water when people “vote for the slogan”.

As discussion followed, Fohrman later reported some amendments to the vision/mission: “To inspire and enable student success in an environment that ~~embraces~~ (revised to read **IS STRENGTHENED BY**) diversity, is responsive to our communities and fosters scholarship, leadership and responsibility.”

Values:

Access, equity, scholarship, excellence, diversity, integrity, respect, accountability, sustainability.

Small Group Discussion/Group Activity:

Group 2 – Strategic Planning Model

Group 2 report: Kavalier reported on the strategic planning model, a “model” within the model, a plan for using the model, and a reporting plan.

Law used the analogy of the strategic planning model “seed” being the Mission Statement. He needs to “feed” his family and the “land” is Mesa College. A timetable to “grow” the crops is needed. These “crops” would be specialized for each of us. Then, the next step involves the “production phase” involving the planting and growing.

To further his example, he also used the analogy of the model being a “date”. He explained what goes into getting a date and why he may not be successful with dating. Everyone has a personal plan. Cepeda added that it is important to share these plans with the rest of the campus.

Hands reported: What would this look like on a website? We should ensure a common language is used. The website should be set up so the user clicks on the Mission and this information, along with the District Mission pops up on the screen. Then, if the user clicks on performance indicators, its definition, along with Mesa’s indicators pops up on the screen. Finally, if the user clicks on assessment, multiple pieces of information pops up on the screen such as campus, District, and State level data. The College, Department as well as District goals, along with their definitions, would also pop up on the screen.

She noted the importance of maintaining current as well as transparent Information online. In addition, the chart will note the students and community are at the center of our focus.

Discussion followed as to the type of information that is acceptable for posting online. It was noted that several colleges post a lot of information online for everyone to read. Craft suggested advance planning to determine what information would be posted via the internet or the intranet.

Cepeda added there is an issue concerning posting of policies and procedures. Currently, it has been found that the Board of Trustees is “out of compliance” with the information posted. Policies and procedures should be available to the public and the Board is currently developing a process for posting this information on the internet. Currently, this information is part of an intranet.

Small Group Discussion/Group Activity:

Group 3 - Performance Indicators

Group 3 report: Weiss reported on performance indicators, referring to a handout with the title “College-Level Indicators”.

Mun compared evaluation to health assessment. There are multiple factors that affect the human body, including physical, emotional, mental and psychological. In the same way one evaluates the health of the person using multiple Indicators, we need to use multiple performance indicators to evaluate student learning and the effectiveness of our institution.

Mun continued by stating that with performance indicators, there are benchmarks such as retention, success, and progress and we often look at ranges of performance. Just as the body is responsive to climate, environment, and outside pressure, the institution is responsive to outside factors, which is why we look at the Environmental scan, economics and the labor market.

There are also uncontrollable factors such as age, genetics, and human development when looking at human health. Likewise, we examine uncontrollable variables such as demographics, region, and preparedness.

In the same way that you improve your health based on research-based practices – exercise, nutrition we improve student learning through research-based practices such as Supplemental Instruction and hopefully regional mandatory assessment.

Small Group Discussion/Group Activity:

Group 4 - Goals

Group 4 report: Bergland reported on five draft College goals. She indicated that the group is recommending the use of “goals” rather than strategic indicators as a label for these. The group envisioned that the College-wide goals would be supported by objectives articulated by each of the three divisions. In turn, each division’s programs or service areas would report supporting objectives in their program reviews. Appropriate performance indicators would be used at each level.

<p>Small Group Discussion/Group Activity:</p> <p>Group 4 - Goals</p> <p>Group 4 report (continued):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver exemplary teaching and learning. 2. Promote a learning environment that provides access and student success. 3. Provide a variety of support services to promote teaching and learning. 4. Increase sustainability 5. Provide leadership in the development of current and future needs of our service area. 		
<p>Building Consensus/Summary</p> <p>Cepeda summarized the discussion as follows:</p> <p>There is a notion of “communities” – from a small concept to a global one. We need to be clear about what we mean by “communities” – faculty, staff, service areas, regional, state, district, global. Also, communities like local businesses, industry. Also, military community.</p> <p>She also added not only do we need tools and measurements but also ways to be more proactive in shaping the future.</p> <p>She summarized work on performance indicators. They have already been established by government and our system. We have benchmarks and indicators. However, there is a second type of performance indicators we establish for ourselves.</p> <p>She summarized discussion on the goals, noting that these need to be streamlined and measurable as well as personal.</p>	<p>Rita C.</p>	<p>1:20-1:30 2:20 – 2:30?</p>
<p>Next Steps: The Summer and Beyond</p> <p>Cepeda noted the next steps involve finalization of the vision, mission, and values and have the information available for distribution during the first weeks in the fall semester. Also, it was agreed that the strategic model should be personal and ubiquitous. The data associated needs to be uploaded on the intranet or internet, depending upon the decision made at a later time.</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>1:30-2:00 2:30 – 3:00?</p>

Next Steps: The Summer and Beyond (continued)

Also, a timetable to move forward will be established. Cepeda requested a small group of individuals work on aligning this information and creating a cohesive document during the summer. The first item on that agenda would be to finalize the vision, mission, values statement. In addition, align the work done at this retreat with other components of the strategic plan, then have a timetable to document we are engaging in the planning process toward the implementation of this information.

As part of the next steps, Cepeda noted that as a body, we “recommend to accept” the document presented at the retreat. When a future meeting is scheduled, we should have a thumb sketch of a model that works for us.

Teegarden suggested that while she feels the model is acceptable, an agreement should be made at a President’s Cabinet meeting. She suggested that we postpone work on the mission, vision, values part this information is presented at an Academic Affairs Committee meeting. That group meets on Monday, April 27th, at which time Teegarden volunteered to provide a draft document from the retreat for their review. She also suggested that work begin at the end of this semester for finalization in the fall semester.

Cepeda agreed with Teegarden’s suggestion to present a one-page draft document of the work completed at the retreat. She added that by the 6th week into the fall semester, a vision, mission, and values document should be ready for approval.

Discussion continued as to a timeline for student feedback. It was suggested that Law share the retreat information with the student representative on the Academic Affairs Committee. It was further suggested that if this information is presented for review by the Academic Affairs Committee before the end of the spring semester, it would be possible to move forward with the next steps during the summer in order to meet the timeline during the fall semester.

Cepeda added that the Academic Affairs Committee should be informed that the current statement was restructured and no “new” information was added. It was reviewed, and reordered to fit as a one page document.

Teegarden suggested that work begin to develop some of the objectives that define the goals.

<p>Next Steps: The Summer and Beyond (continued)</p> <p>Heil suggested this document be reviewed by the Marketing Committee. Cepeda indicated that a marketing plan could be developed.</p> <p>Craft noted reference to the term “communities” may be controversial in that it may mean such areas as Chula Vista. He suggested using the word “constituents” instead. Fohrman added that word “communities” was listed on the original mission statement and discussion on use of that term took place. Craft suggested using the singular “community” rather than the plural version.</p> <p>Cepeda requested the subcommittee who worked on these tasks last summer continue their work this summer. She asked for additional volunteers for this task and the following volunteers agreed to participate: Barbara Kavalier, Larry Weiss, Jonathan Fohrman, Michael McLaren, Lina Heil, William Craft, Ron Perez, Yvonne Bergland, Cynthia Rico-Bravo, Terrie Teegarden, Susan Mun and Rita Cepeda.</p>		
<p>Closing Exercise: RLO/CLO/EYL “You’ll know it when you see it”</p> <p>Cepeda introduced a closing exercise involving the meaning of the acronyms RLO/CLO/EYL. After some guessing and discussion, the answers were revealed as Retreat Learning Outcomes (RLO); Cabinet Learning Outcomes (CLO), Earn Your Lunch (EYL).</p> <p>Cepeda thanked the group for their work during the retreat.</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>2:00-2:30 3:00 – 3:30?</p>

Adjournment at: 2:57 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by Caterina Palestini, Senior Secretary
Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research