Accreditation RTF Standard I Subgroup Minutes

April 5, 2013; 2:00-4:30 PM

In attendance: Cindy Delain, Ryan Barry-Souza, Stephanie Collier, John Boragno, Dave Bird and Christian Anderson

1. The committee voted to forward version 3.2 of the integrated planning model to Senior Management Council for recommendation.

2. The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing and responding to Senior Management Council’s “Response Task Force Sub Group Format for Recommendations.” A draft of the result of this dialog is appended below.

__________________________________________________________________________________

Response Task Force Sub Group I
Recommendation 1

1) State the problem or issue.

The College of the Sequoias does not currently possess a model for Integrated Planning (Recommendation 3; Standards 1A3, 1A4. IB1, IB2, IB3, IB4, IB5, IB6)

2) Gather data on the problem/issue.

An initial planning summit was held on Feb. 22. At this meeting, members of the Academic Senate, Institutional Program Review, Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, Research Advisory, and Outcomes Assessment committees were introduced to ACCJC planning standards as well as sample integrated planning models from other colleges. In addition, participants reviewed and summarized the college’s current planning constituencies and structures. During a follow up meeting on Mar. 8, attendees assessed the college’s current planning process and worked to develop a draft integrated model. Qualitative data (including agendas, source material, working documents and findings) from these meetings can be accessed at: http://intranet.cos.edu/department/committee/collegecouncil/Planning/Pages/Integrated%20Planning%20Summit.aspx. As a result of this analysis, the committee found the college’s current planning processes to be out of compliance with accreditation Standard I to the extent the existing processes fail to:

- Explicitly recognize the college’s mission as central to planning and decision making (IA4)
- Integrate planning efforts at the levels of campus operation (IB2, IB3, IB6)
- Generate self-reflective dialogue regarding the improvement of student learning and institutional processes (IB1)
- Be well understood by campus constituencies (IB2)
- Be consistently applied to the process of resource allocation (IB4)
• Be systematically evaluated (IA3, IB3, IB6)

Using the draft model developed during the second summit, the Standard I Response Task Force sub-committee worked with Dr. Eva Conrad to identify gaps and refine the colleges integrated planning process on Mar. 13, 14, and 20. During these meetings the sub-committee substantially produced the attached graphical representation of the proposed planning model and a narrative overview summarizing the process. A final revision was made during weekly sub-group meeting on Mar. 22 and approved by the committee for recommendation to the Response Task Force on Apr. 5.

3) Describe the proposed resolution. (4-W’s and How?)

The committee proposes that the college adopt the attached model for Integrated Planning.

Who: Academic Senate, College Council, President/Superintendent, and Board of trustees.

What: Approve and adopt within the college’s participatory governance processes.

When: Before the conclusion of the Spring 2013 semester.

Why: The recommended Integrated Planning model will allow the college to demonstrate that it uses quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished (I).

4) Describe assessment process.

Data analysis performed in conjunction with the COS Annual College Report on the Master Plan will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Integrated Planning model in meeting District Objectives and achieving District Goals (IB1, IB2). This evaluation will occur systematically on a three-year cycle (IB6).