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“Strategic Planning is the ongoing process of self-examination, the confrontation of difficult choices, and establishment of priorities”

- John Kotter
- Author of Leading Change
## Cañada Strategic Planning 5-Year Cycle

### Other planning occurring this year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cañada College Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 07-08 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 11-12 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td>Implementing 11-12 Strategic Plan &amp; Annual Progress Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Program Review</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td>All Instruction &amp; Student Services Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Program Review</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td>Staggered, 6 year recurring cycle for each department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCCD District Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td>Environmental Scanning</td>
<td>Planning Assumptions &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Master Plan (FMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update FMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Technology Master Plan (TMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Resource Allocation Plan</td>
<td>Reviewed and evaluated</td>
<td>Reviewed and evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Student Equity Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Technology Plan</td>
<td>Implement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ambitions for the Process

Process Goals

• Extensive student participation
• Deep & broad engagement with faculty & staff
• New formal lines of dialog with key external stakeholders

Desired outcomes

• Campus-wide ownership of final plan
• Prioritized list of strategies each linked to core indicators
• Progress against goals assessed & discussed routinely
• Cañada identified as a Best Practice in strategic planning
**CPC**

- Approves overall process
- Drive development of Mission, Vision, Values
- Review data and survey findings to determine Key planning issues
- Appoint/recommend participants of oversight committee
- Identify parameters for Working Group membership
- Review & approve final plan

**Strategic Planning Oversight Committee**

- Supports the process generally / recommends direction
- Makes sure process and output meets all external requirements/forces
- Sounding board for ideas and output
- Composed of members of Admin Council plus members appointed by CPC

**IPC & SSPC**

- Direct the investigation of Working Groups
- Review w/ Working Groups stakeholder related data/information
- Recommend metrics & indicators linked to goals

**Working Groups**

- Develop stakeholder profiles
- With support from Office of Planning lead collection of stakeholder data/info
- Engage stakeholders directly / develop formal lines of communication
- Reports back to CPC (at intervals and at close)
Office of President makes formal recommendation to Office of Planning & Research. Office of Planning & Research makes recommendation to change process to Strategic Planning Oversight Committee. Strategic Planning Oversight Committee makes formal charge to implement recommendation to College Planning Council. College Planning Council conveys recommendation to Office of President.
Stakeholder Framework

WORKING GROUP FOCUS AREAS

Internal Stakeholders

- **Working Group #1** – Student related goals
- **Working Group #2** – Faculty & Staff related goals

External Stakeholders

- **Working Group #3** – Employer & Alumni related goals
- **Working Group #4** – Goals related to some or all of the following: local residents, prospective students, K-12 schools, universities, government agencies, accreditation agencies, sister colleges, SMCCD District, Board of Trustees, former employees, prospective employees, public at-large, others

PROFILE OF WORKING GROUPS

- Four Working Groups; up to eight people per working group
- CPC Identifies parameters for Working Group membership
- Work closely with IPC & SSPC on development of goals
- Work closely with Planning Office on development of assessment instruments & outcome metrics
Strategic Planning Thirty Month Calendar

2010

Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec

Prep & pre-planning
Process Validation
Mission, Vision & Values
Collection of aggregate data to drive Working Groups
Working Groups develop stakeholder goals/strategies

2011

Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec

Leader -> CPC OPRSS WG, IPC, SSPC

Working Groups develop stakeholder goals/strategies; write up findings & prepare formal report to present to CPC in Aug
Synthesize Working Group Output into coherent set of goals/plans
CPC vetting, reflection prioritizing; foundation for draft plan

2012

Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec

Write draft Plan; capture feedback from college
Write Final Plan

CPC, WT, OPRSS WT

WT – Writing Team
WG – Working Groups
OPRSS – Office of Planning, Research & Student Success
Aggregate Metrics & Benchmarks

Accountability Report for Community Colleges

1. Released annually by the Chancellor’s Office
2. Set of seven College Performance Indicators
3. Peer Group Benchmarks (CCCs)
4. Includes a brief self-assessment
5. Report is shared with Board of Trustees & the Public
ARCC Indicators

1. Student Progress & Achievement
2. Completed 30 or More Units
3. Fall to Fall Persistence
4. Vocational Course Completion
5. Basic Skills Course Completion
6. ESL Course Improvement
7. Basic Skills Course Improvement

**Note on Peer Groups:** Peer Groups are determined by examining a set of institutional and program specific characteristics across the California Community College System. Peer groups are indicator specific, and therefore the list of colleges in the peer group changes for each indicator.
ARCC Table 1.1: Student Progress & Achievement Rate

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who achieved any of the following outcomes within six years: Transferred to a four-year college; or earned an AA/AS; or earned a Certificate (18 units or more); or achieved "Transfer Directed" or Transfer Prepared status

Peer Leader
State Ave (52.8%) (52.3%)
Peer Ave 49.0% (43.7%)

Peer Group for Indicator: Canada; Compton; L.A. City; L.A. Trade-Tech; Merced; Mission; Rio Hondo; Santa Ana; Southwest L.A.
ARCC Table 1.1a: Percent of Students Earning 30+ Units

Percentage of first-time students who showed intent to complete and who earned at least 30 units while in the California Community College System.

Peer Leader (77.2%)
Peer Ave (74.0%)
State Ave (72.4%)

Cañada
CSM
Skyline

Peer Group for Indicator: Canada; Foothill; Marin; San Mateo; West Valley.
Percentage of first-time students with a minimum of six units earned in a Fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent Fall term anywhere in the system.

Peer Group for Indicator: Canada; Canyons; De Anza; Diablo Valley; Evergreen Valley; Foothill; Gavilan; Irvine Valley; Las Positas; Marin; Mission; Moorpark; Ohlone; Saddleback; San Jose City, San Mateo, West Valley
ARCC Table 1.3: Annual Successful Course Completion Rates
(Vocational Courses)

Peer Leader (84.8%)
State Ave (77.5%)
Peer Ave (72.4%)

Success was defined as having been retained to the end of the term (or end of the course) with a final course grade of A, B, C, or P.

ARCC Table 1.4: Annual Successful Course Completion Rates
(Credit Basic Skills Courses)

Success was defined as having been retained to the end of the term (or end of the course) with a final course grade of A, B, C, or P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cañada</th>
<th>CSM</th>
<th>Skyline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 to 2007</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 to 2008</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 to 2009</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Leader (66.8%)
State Ave (61.5%)
Peer Ave (57.6%)

ARCC Table 1.5: Improvement Rates for ESL

Students enrolled in an ESL course (two or more levels below college level/transfer level) who successfully completed the initial ESL course and then successfully completed a higher-level ESL course within three academic years.

- **Cañada**: 42.4% in 2004/05 to 2006/07, 40.8% in 2005/06 to 2007/08, 39.5% in 2006/07 to 2008/09
- **CSM**: 50.1% (2004/05 to 2006/07), 45% (2005/06 to 2007/08), 40% (2006/07 to 2008/09)
- **Skyline**: 49.0% (2004/05 to 2006/07), 44% (2005/06 to 2007/08), 39.5% (2006/07 to 2008/09)

ARCC Table 1.5: Improvement Rates for Credit Basic Skills

Students enrolled in a credit basic skills English or Mathematics course (two or more levels below college level/transfer level) who successfully completed the initial basic skills course and then successfully completed a higher-level course in the same discipline within three academic years.

Peer Leader: 65.9%
State Ave: 53.2%
Peer Ave: 35.6%

Peer Group for Indicator: Allan Hancock, Barstow, Berkeley City College, Canada, Cerro Coso, Coastline, Columbia, Contra Costa, Cuyamaca, Feather River, Gavilan, Irvine Valley, Lake Tahoe, Laney, Lassen, Marin, Mendocino, Merritt, Mission, Monterey, Napa Valley, Palo Verde, Siskiyous, Taft, West Valley
Indicators connect the mission of the college and the results it produces with the needs of its stakeholders.

**Internal Stakeholders**
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Administration
- District
- Board of Trustees

**External Stakeholders**
- Employers
- Prospective Students
- Student Alumni
- K-12 Schools
- Four Year Universities
- Prospective Employees
- Former Employees
- Local Residents
- Government Agencies
- Accreditation Agencies
Planning development tools we will be using

Feedback Instruments

• Mission, vision & values survey
• Comprehensive Student Services Survey
• Noel-Levitz Survey (Spring 2010)
• Student surveys & focus groups
• Employer surveys*
• Alumni surveys*
• Community Surveys*

Reference info

• Current Strategic Plan & Supporting Documents
• Educational Master Plan
• District Strategic Plan
• Accreditation Report
• ARCC Indicator Report
• IPEDS Data Report
• Research Office Output
• SMCCD Fact Book
• Program Review reports

Existing Planning Infrastructure

• CPC, IPC, SPC Budget
• Program Review
• SLOs
• Flex Days

Emerging Planning Infrastructure

• CIETL
• Learning Assessment Tools
• Annual Program Review (Student Services)
• TracDAT & CurricuNET

* Optional Elements
What do we want to be?

Characteristics of High Performing Colleges

1. Courageous, shared leadership
   - Not an earnest series of add-on programs, but fundamental reorientation of basic skills education.
   - Risk-taking is actively encouraged by senior leadership.
   - Faculty constantly testing the pedagogical merits of new practices.
   - Successes are openly celebrated; failed experiments are cherished as powerful learning tools.

2. Fearless engagement with data & reflective practice
   - Faculty & staff routinely collect & review granular data from the classroom & service area.
   - Time specifically reserved for reflection and dialog on data is crucial.
   - Simple, meaningful metrics are as powerful as large research undertakings.
   - Faculty & staff display courage about the interpretation of research findings.

3. Structured, integrated strategies
   - No existing processes or structures are immune to rethinking.
   - Student goals are linked tightly to pathway models & pathway interventions.
   - Multiple access points to academic & student service support.

Source: RP Group: lessons for the Hewlett Leaders in Student Success Initiative
Let’s Get Busy