

Santa Fe College
Resource Planning Council
April 22, 2010
Northwest Campus, Room S-318

Minutes

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order

Dr. Mike Droll called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm.

The following members of the council were present:

Dr. Mike Droll, Co-chair	Ms. Julie Shay
Ms. Ginger Gibson, Co-chair	Mr. David Shlafer
Dr. Kelly Gridley	Ms. Joan Suchorski
Ms. Karen Griffin	
Ms. Barbara Hirschfelder	
Ms. Jean Hutton	
Mr. Paul Hutchins	
Mr. Eugene Jones	
Mr. Tim Nesler	
Mr. David Price	
Mr. Dan Rodkin	Dr. Ed Bonahue - Ex Officio
Ms. Laurel Severino	Dr. Portia Taylor – Ex Officio

The following members were not present:

Ms. Gayle Davis	Dr. Bruce Tucker
Ms. Lela Elmore	Drew Hart- Student
Mr. Steve Fisher	
Mr. Michael Hutley	Mr. Chuck Clemons- Ex Officio
Mr. Bill Reese	Mr. Guy York – Ex Officio
Ms. Angie Siekers	
Mr. Clay Smith	
Ms. Lynn Speer	
Ms. Lynn Sullivan	
Ms. Marilyn Tubb	

Droll asked how many of the council had seen the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) presentation before. Eugene Jones and Ed Bonahue said that they had. Droll announced that Ramona Miller-Ridlon would be showing it to the council at 2:30 pm.

2.0 Receive President’s Staff Review of the Updated Strategic Plan. – Ginger Gibson

Droll asked the vice presidents in the room to share some feedback from the President’s Staff meeting on the revised Mission Statement. Ginger Gibson said the

council was asked to look at one thing on the mission statement, the phrase “as well as” and to change that phrase to “and”. A printout of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013 was made available from an email sent by Droll that morning to the council members, which included the revised mission statement. It reads:

“In keeping with our values and goals, Santa Fe College, a comprehensive public institution of higher education serving North Central Florida and beyond, adds value to the lives of our students and enriches our community through excellence in teaching and learning, innovative educational programs and student services, as well as community leadership and service.”

Gibson asked if anyone had an opinion. Bonahue stated that either one would be fine, keeping a parallelism of the clause; the word “and” wouldn’t change the meaning of the statement. Gibson also stated that Dr. Jackson Sasser would like the revised statement to be shared with the College Senate, Career Service Council, and Student Government for comment and acceptance before being sent to the Board of Trustees for approval. Bonahue mentioned that the Board of Trustees asked the meaning of “adding value” in the statement. Bonahue stated that it is a slogan, a motto, a tag line but not a mission statement. For catalog and other printed material purposes it should be the whole mission statement but not the tag line only. David Shlafer asked where do the words “the smart choice” fit in? Bonahue responds it is just a “brand word”, an issue from marketing that Marilyn Tubb is working upon. Droll responds that we should look at a bigger global picture, we can only work on one statement at a time and the mission statement should be a full description of what we are. Gibson said that the Senate needs to review the change on the mission statement and Bonahue suggested that Dave Price, since he was here and President of the Senate, put it before them. Gibson agreed that would be helpful. Price said the next meeting of the Senate was scheduled for May 11, 2010. Gibson said the report was due back to the Trustees on May 17, 2010 so that would work out well. Gibson had more to report from the President’s Staff meeting. “What was the Strategic Plan for next year?” Gibson said what needs to occur is obtaining details from the groups formed by this council on the strategic initiatives. The groups need to develop a work plan by July 11, 2010 in response to the SACS deadline, need to identify those quadrants. Gibson suggested a possibility, if needed, of another category, something to carry over initiatives from previous years to show continuity. Bonahue said we need a timeline and by May 1, 2010 we need to respond to Dr. Curtis Jefferson.

Action: *A motion for approval of the change in wording of the Mission Statement was made by David Shlafer.*
Price will take the revised mission statement before Senate for review.

3.0 General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Presentation – Ramona Miller-Ridlon

At 2:35pm Droll gave the committee members a handout on Xi planning software. He said our interest in this particular software is two-fold, firstly to ease ourselves into

recording data and secondly for the planning module that was offered with this particular software. He also said “Basically there are only two brands of software out there that are feasible and this is one.” Droll introduced Ramon Miller-Ridlon from the Department of English. Miller-Ridlon stated the Dave Yonutas was the creator of the PowerPoint presentation she was about to show. Topics of the presentation were; The Purpose of GELO Assessment and The Intersection of Elements. Miller-Ridlon said that right now the goals were to meet SACS requirements, for faculty self-evaluations and for improving instruction. In the institutional context it would..... with the mission and values. Miller-Ridlon referred to the handout *General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO)* which can be found on the Santa Fe website by typing in “GELO/General Education Map” in the search bar. These replace the 21st Century Learning Outcomes in 2002. Some changes noted were in communication and the loss of technical proficiency. Eugene Jones asked if these learning outcomes came from the state of Florida. Bonahue responded that some did. Jones asked “Then we modified it to fit Santa Fe?” Miller-Ridlon said that the first sentence came from the state. The rest was modified for Santa Fe. Example: **COMMUNICATION: State Outcome:** Read, write, speak, and listen effectively. **SF Outcome:** Develop effective reading, writing, speaking, listening and nonverbal communication skills. Miller-Ridlon stated that Santa Fe thought it over, looked at Miami-Dade’s testing, looked at capstone courses and determined SF did not have the time to do the outcomes for it, and also looked at embedded assessment and chose not to use them because it relied on instructor’s objectivity. SF mapped eleven general outcomes and linked them to a general education category. The outcomes should trickle down to the classroom through here. How the overall mechanism works. Each instructor evaluates the class in some format that comes from the department. They must assess that outcome in that course even if it is not the primary outcome of your class. For example: Humanities B-Core Humanities, the outcome would be critical thinking. The next step is to enter student success or lack of success on eStaff beginning when the grades become due. The selection option only shows up on general education courses. Then IT will aggregate the data. Miller-Ridlon went to the slide *eStaff Interface* to demonstrate how it will look on eStaff and then on to the proposed timeline slide. David Price said that in his department there was some confusion over the word “pilot” and what it meant. Does it mean voluntary or are all faculty required to check whether or not a student has completed a GELO? Bonahue answers that it is a requirement. It will show by department which ones have not participated. Price asks if the grades will still be submitted if an instructor does not check a learning outcome. Bonahue answers that he thinks that grades will still go through without participation. Droll said from the SACS perspective that grades do not constitute a learning outcome. How we authenticate and assess the learning outcome is important. Miller-Ridlon mentioned that this is not a student “thing” because students won’t see if they have met a LO or not. Bonahue mentioned the consequences of not satisfying this core requirement can lead to sanctions and loss of accreditation. Miller-Ridlon assured that this plan has worked at other schools and that for right now this is really just for us. Sometimes just asking students how they thought they did. Jean Hutton asks if the professors are to retain information on their learning outcomes. Miller-Ridlon said yes. Bonahue said we are not down to the level of actual documentation

of student learning. Kelly Gridley asks if we can compare SF students' LO with other students and how is the learning outcome to be assessed at the BAS level. General learning outcomes are not assessed in the upper division. Price recalls the comment that these assessments can be used as part of a faculty evaluation but is there any SACS definition that they must be used? Price also asks what safeguards are in place to refrain from a punitive nature for not complying? Bonahue responds to the first question with no and to the second that the department chair is the safeguard. Miller-Ridlon closes by reminding the council that this information is on the college website, and to feel free to contact Dave Yonutas who can answer any questions they might have.

Bonahue gives kudos to Miller-Ridlon for stepping up to chair the committee. Droll welcomes Jean Hutton to the RPC. Droll apologizes for putting Ginger Gibson on the spot with a budget update.

4.0 Budget to Planning Update – Ginger Gibson

Gibson announces that they are in the process of linking the budget to planning and developing a plan among the strategic initiatives, operational budget and some college initiatives. Portia Taylor mentions that, college wide, as departments are going over next year's budgets try to tack them to a strategic initiative. Droll asks if we are withholding a new strategic plan. Price mentions that if it comes before the Senate it will be publicized. Gibson said there is a draft of a document from Teaching and Learning and an O.D. group as well. Price has a concern that Salary and Benefits hasn't been meeting as usual. His concern is that the budget seems to be moving forward and will need the information from Salary and Benefits. Gibson responds that before any decision is made the budget committee always goes back to Salary and Benefits. Price has a feeling that that input is not being requested. Karen Griffin mentions that Career Service has after some discussion presented to Lela Elmore. They feel that Elmore and Guy York will take their feelings into account. Price asks when and where? Portia Taylor said at the President's Staff meeting. Gibson said that if each group wanted to present to the President's Staff that would be arranged.

5.0 Droll adjourned the Council at 3:15 pm

Next meeting will be May 20, 2010