

SSSP-SEP-BSI-BSSOT-CTE-SWP-SEM Alignment Meeting

Monday, April 10, 2017

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

N-206

Minutes

Attendees: Patricia Hsieh, Brett Bell, Gerald Ramsey, Daniel Miramontez, Jacque Honda, Xi Zhang, Laura Murphy, Naomi Grisham, Becky Stephens, Stefanie Johnson Shipman, Paulette Hopkins, Mary Kjartanson, Denise Kapitzke, Briele Warren

Absent: Marie McMahon, Lynne Ornelas, Steve Quis

Items: **1.) Status update on Game Plan and Timeline for SSSP-SEP-BSI Integrated Plan 2017-19**

a. Phase 1: Previous Accomplishments (Due 3/30/17)

i. Go Over Status Report for Items Due 3/30/17

Hsieh shared the alignment worksheet tool that serves to assist with the process. Ramsey noted that they used the worksheet to build the current document that he and Honda were sharing at the meeting. He showed a list of activities that were done by each plan, as well as the associated goals. In SSSP, the plan was designed to provide the ways they go about accomplishing the objectives of that program, however it did not outline the specific goals necessarily. He presented a summary of the progress made. There were some activities that had not been conducted, and they would be addressed.

Stephens noted that their goals were already set, and they had pulled out the activities from their fixed projects (what they actually do), and linked them to the four goals, along with a commentary of the progress of each. Each year when applications were received for projects, questions are answered on the applications, and as a result they already have those reports for the projects.

Hsieh asked how the goals and activities align and correspond to relate to the indicators and budget areas, as the columns on Ramsey's document did not match the worksheet tool. Discussion ensued on the clarifications of each column of the alignment worksheet. Hopkins noted that Basic Skills was not as broad as the information presented in the budget area column, and that the information was pulled from BSSOT. Stephens commented that placement was not part of their performance or success indicators, although it was something that they reported. It was agreed that the BSI row on the worksheet would be addressed and rewritten to be consistent with BSI practices. Miramontez noted that it seemed that only half of the work was done, and that he did not see the alignment across the three areas. Stephens mentioned that the information provided to them was for BSSOT, but now

that the information was clarified as to what was needed, they could work on BSI.

Hsieh used the QFE as an example: while it is a concise summary, the college spent a lot of time going through accreditation standard requirements, and the college has a comprehensive understanding of what is done (even though Ramsey said that the state report only allowed 100 words). This is a great opportunity to do a self-assessment for improvement and motivation, and there were multiple purposes to this, not just to meet the State requirement. The work that was already done is a good start. Hsieh stressed the importance of continued dialogue and discussion.

Murphy asked if the areas under budget were defined categories, and Bell confirmed that they were.

Stephens shared that it was frustrating to come in after the discussions had already taken place, and Hsieh expressed that she appreciated the feedback, as it was valuable. Everyone needed to work together and ask questions.

Johnson Shipman asked for the most recent alignment worksheet (materials and direction) to get started.

b. Phase 2: Future Plans (Due 4/21/17)

i. Progress Update for Items Due 4/21/17

Zhang shared that the next phase would need results from the first phase, which has not yet been completed. The first phase still requires a comprehensive assessment of progress towards the goals. According to the received letter, the college is supposed to look at the effectiveness of the activities and if they are addressing the identified goals. They are currently developing goals to see if they address the success indicators.

The questions to ask should address: "Is it working?" "How much is the impact?" "How successful and effective?" "Across all of the assessment results, have they been realizing the proposed goals?" "Are the allocated resources working?" At that point, then they can identify one best practice that works through the proposed activities and allocated resources. Once identified, this will complete the first phase that the second phase can build on.

Hopkins noted that the math center needs to install its own tracking system to have more reliable data. Hsieh expressed that she was happy that the quality of data was being brought forward.

Miramontez commented that there were two types of data: no data and bad data. Stephens noted that there were collection issues and lurking variables. Hsieh stressed that dialogue was needed, and that if anyone was unclear about the next step, to discuss this. Bell noted that they have year-end budget and expense reports for SSSP, SEP, and Basic Skills, which requires reports on financial data on all of the items. His office would give Honda,

Ramsey, Hopkins, Johnson Shipman, and Stephens the information to work with.

Hsieh asked when the first phase could be finished, and Stephens mentioned two weeks. Hsieh said that Monday, April 24th would be set as a deadline for completion of the first phase. If there were any challenges, Hsieh asked for them to be communicated amongst the group, and not to wait until April 24th.

2.) Discuss Subsequent Initiative Alignments Based on Template (BSI-BSSOT, CTE-SWP)

Item tabled until #1.a & 1.b were completed.

3.) Future Meeting Dates

Hsieh said the purpose of the meetings was to make sure everyone is on the same page. The workgroup would be Honda, Miramontez, Zhang, Ramsey, Honda, Johnson Shipman, and Stephens, but instead of the whole group meeting on a regular basis, they could come back whenever they were ready, as it would be a better use of everyone's time.