

# **STUDENT SERVICES COUNCIL**

SUMMARY NOTES

DATE- 10-30-13

9:00 A.M. --- ROOM #2314

---

Present: Kevin O'Rorke, Tim Johnston, Connie Barton, Nancy Berkey, Nadia Elwood, Liz Kohn, Sylvia Ruano, Sandra Hamilton Slane, Sheree Whaley, Sherry Nicholas

Absent: Will

Guests: None

## **DISCUSSION-**

**All Annual Area Plans (DRAFTS)-** Updates and a brief review was given on for each area.

**Planning Process Evaluation Update-** Tim updated the council on the role of this committee. The committee developed questions and disseminated them to each group on campus. The feedback will be summarized and be present at the next College Council meeting. A summary of the feedback is listed below:

### **How widespread was participation in the process? How can we increase participation?**

- Historically, there was a gap in the feedback loop after priorities left the Division.
- It was difficult to rank 150+ initiatives from Instructional areas.
- Most Student Services initiatives were moved forward.
- The President's Office sent a list of initiatives and where each initiative was ranked. This provided transparency to the process.
- Student Senate asked for and received a list of funded initiatives.
- It would be helpful to re-clarify staff roles throughout the process regarding the expected input at each step of the process.
- Some staff choose to participate; others choose not to participate.
- May wish to provide a "sign-off" form to indicate that, while all may not agree with the outcomes, all staff members had the opportunity to participate.
- A "sign-off" form may create an additional opportunity for conversation.
- Managers / Coordinators should share decisions made at the Division level back with their respective department(s).
- Important to whittle away at the attitude that this process is independent of funding source(s). For example, categorical programs should include all initiatives even though they may be funded outside of the general fund. All programs, regardless of funding, should support the college's mission/direction.

### **Does the planning timeline need to be adjusted? If so, in what way(s)?**

- The consensus of the group indicated that this cycle would be less intense than last year's cycle.
- There is an apparent lag between the submission of Division rankings and feedback on what was funded.
- There is a need to clarify the roles of the Budget Committee and the Technology Committee in the process.
- The Budget Committee grappled with the definition of program "feasibility". It may be important to provide additional guidance in this area.

### **Does the rubric serve as an effective tool in the prioritization of initiatives? If not, what would you change?**

- Student Services should add "access" and "equity" to the district-wide / general rubric.
- There is a need to discuss the advantages/disadvantages of using the same rubric as College Council versus each Division having its own.
- Student Services should keep "access" and "equity" on the Division-specific rubric.
- It is important for the rubric(s) to be available before program presentations at the Division level.
- It is important to have a rubric score and an overall score.
- The current rubric is a "fiscally-driven" rubric.
- The Student Services Division will continue to combine initiatives / requests before moving them forward.
- This cycle, representatives from SSC, Instruction and Administrative Services will meet to combine similar initiatives.
- It is recommended that the Student Services Council compare last year's rubric with the current, recommended revisions.

### **How can we improve the planning process?**

- The spirit of the planning process should permit the introduction of initiatives earlier – e.g. during the spring – should funding permit.
- It is difficult to evaluate the outcomes from the previous year when we haven't completed a cycle.
- It may be more valuable to evaluate the process on a two-year cycle recognizing that there is a risk of big changes with each evaluation.
- It's difficult to measure the impact if you "don't approve" an initiative.
- There is confusion regarding the accuracy of the perception that "If it's not on the area plan, then we aren't going to do it".
- The guideline should be that if a department is asking for new funds, then it should be in the area plan.
- The IT Department should say "here's what we will need to support your project" instead of saying "we can't or we won't do that".
- There is a question regarding the role of IT in the decision-making process.
- There is a need to confirm how a department will capture an initiative's ongoing progress.
- Recommend creating folders for each year rather than write a long list of text.
- Recommend that departments receive more and more specific data.
- There is more confidence in the accuracy of data.
- Recommend the addition of a statement similar to the one in the Instruction Program Review template regarding "what additional data needs do you have".

**High School Counselor Day-** Scheduled for Nov 8. All is ready to go for this event.

Draft Agenda for SS Training Day- Pending

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS / AREA UPDATES-**

**OTHER** – None

Meeting ended: 11:00 a.m.