

Santa Fe College
Resource Planning Council
March 18, 2010
Northwest Campus, Room S-318

Minutes

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order

Dr. Mike Droll called the meeting to order at 2:10 pm.

The following members of the council were present:

Dr. Mike Droll, Co-chair	Ms. Laurel Severino
Ms. Ginger Gibson, Co-chair	Ms. Angie Siekers
Mr. Steve Fisher	Ms. Julie Shay
Ms. Karen Griffin	Mr. David Shlafer
Ms. Kelly Gridley	Ms. Lynn Speer
Ms. Barbara Hirschfelder	Ms. Joan Suchorski
Mr. Eugene Jones	Ms. Lynn Sullivan
Mr. Tim Nessler	Dr. Ed Bonahue – Ex Officio
Mr. David Price	Dr. Portia Taylor – Ex Officio
Mr. Bill Reese	

The following members were not present:

Ms. Lela Elmore	Dr. Dave Tegeder
Mr. Paul Hutchins	Ms. Marilyn Tubb
Mr. Michael Hutley	Mr. Drew Hart – Student
Mr. Dan Rodkin	Mr. Chuck Clemmons – Ex Officio
Dr. Clay Smith	Mr. Guy York – Ex Officio

2.0 Approval of Minutes

Droll asked for any comments on last week's minutes. There were none. Droll called for the minutes to be approved. Droll called the council's attention to the current agenda handout and introduced Hirschfelder.

**3.0 Review of Working Group's Recommendation for Expanded Mission Statement
– Barbara Hirschfelder**

Hirschfelder referred to the handout entitled *Proposed Mission Statement Revision*. There were four paragraphs and the first paragraph was chosen by the work group as the best choice. The group was trying to keep the (slogan, motto) together in one part (piece). Hirschfelder questions if a comma should be placed behind values in the last part of the sentence. For example ... "by service to Alachua and Bradford counties in keeping with our values, and goals." Taylor thought the revised mission statement

should include that Santa Fe is a college committed to higher education and added that the college serves more than just Alachua and Bradford counties. Gridley noted the limiting nature of the words Alachua and Bradford counties and that we are not limiting our mission to Alachua and Bradford counties. Droll asked if there was anyone from the working group in attendance. Shlafer replied that he was on one of the working groups. Gridley stated that we were required to be specific in the mission statement but without being limited. Droll suggested the word comprehensive and that the mission statement be sent back to the working group for further revision, and that we are satisfying core requirement 2.1.4. Both Fisher and Hirschfelder were in agreement. Gibson stated that the mission statement should include the mission, vision, values and goals. Jones thought the tag line (slogan, motto) should have a new title, keeping it short, almost a one line sentence but keeping the old vision statement. Bonahue proposed that it sounded jargony. Droll said that the statement should go back to the working group and that the council would come back to it at a later date and asked for a motion.

Action: Jones made a motion to table the statement until a later date. Siekers seconded the motion.

4.0 Data and Planning Overview – Dr. Mike Droll

Droll states that from the year 2000 until the current year many of the plans for the Strategic Initiatives were lost. He would like to see a working group formed to address Strategic Initiatives. Droll gives a PowerPoint presentation on the role of the RPC and a data overview. The RPC should integrate planning and budgeting to support Santa Fe's mission and goals while at the same time being in compliance with core requirements and comprehensive standards. The data Santa Fe has ranges from big documents called plans, for example the Master Plan and the Educational Plant Survey to state reports to individual planning on all levels. We should ask ourselves "What do we need to do to improve our reports?" Examples were given of different types of data; Headcount/FTE, RSS feed (Enviro Scan), Benchmarking (NCCBP), using the BEBR to forecast jobs or educational needs and a hand out from EMSI entitled Occupation Report. There was some discussion of various data elements. Droll stated that he was very encouraged by the council response and reminds them that data supports decision-making.

Action: Droll will provide more detailed data or reports for the council by email or at future meetings.

5.0 QEP Overview – Eugene Jones

Jones provided a PowerPoint lecture to support his overview. He began with a description of what the Quality Enhancement Plan is some examples from other colleges and the guidelines we must follow from SACS. The process must be vetted through the entire college community and we must demonstrate that we have the money in the budget to carry out the plan for five years. There will be an annual

review process. There are three Phases. Phase one will be to pick a topic. Phase two will be decision making on implementation of the plan and Phase three will be to carry out the plan. The Santa Fe process will cover a what, why, when who approach. What – QEP. Why – SACS compliance. When – a detailed timeline was presented. Who – a leadership team comprised of faculty, staff, students, administrators, Board of Trustees and the community at large. Concept Systems will be the new software. Topic selection will be from August 2010 until April 2011. The QEP marketing plan and development will be from May through July 2011. Detailed plan development begins August 2011. Completion of the QEP draft will be in April 2012. The final QEP will be done in June 2012 and submitted to the SACS in July 2012. The On-site SACS visit will be in November 2012.

Action: Eugene Jones

ACTION	DATE
QEP Information sessions (CD, Board, Coordinating Council, RPC, Senate)	March – June 2010
Leadership team formalized	April 2010
Concept Systems training	May 2010
Development engagement campaign	May – July 2010
Leadership attends SACS Institute	June 2010
Topic Selection	August 2010 – April 2011
QEP Marketing Plan Development	May – July 2011
Begin Detailed Plan Development	August 2011
Complete QEP draft	April <i>2012</i>
Complete QEP	June <i>2012</i> (Admin review)
Submit QEP	July <i>2012</i>
On Site Visit	Sept Nov <i>2012</i>

6.0 Strategic Initiative Overview – Ginger Gibson and Mike Droll

Gibson distributed a handout entitled *Proposed College Strategic Initiatives*. It was a draft of three initiatives with room for a proposed fourth. Initiative one covered enrollment growth, initiative two was a catch all for organization and development and initiative three included learning and support services. Droll suggested the council identify several working groups for each initiative. Bonahue suggested a requirement for multiple divisions to work together and not just the ordinary improvements. Droll told the council, after the President’s meeting that morning, that enrollment growth was our number one priority. Gibson said the draft was just a rough document put together from last year’s initiative discussions for illustration purposes. There was a general discussion of initiatives by the council but no concrete decisions made. It was agreed that the points presented were valid and should be considered further. Droll pointed out there was room for a fourth initiative. Jones and Bonahue suggested one topic could be swipe locks for the campus. Bonahue mentioned development of the Institute for Public Safety. Reese said some of these

initiatives might be covered by PECO funding. Bonahue mentioned ITS as another area the council could look at for initiatives. He also said a facilities oriented initiative could be a multiyear commitment that requires everyone to work on it and that in the next week the initiatives should be linked to the goals. Droll asked for a 10% participation in feedback.

7.0 Charge Working Groups to Recommend Strategic Initiatives for the Next Three Years

No members were chosen at this time.

8.0 Meeting Adjourns

Mike Droll adjourns the meeting at 3:58 pm