



**District Planning Committee**  
**March 23, 2018 Minutes**  
**Educational Service Center, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**Attendance:**

Cornner, Ryan	ESC	Master, Sarah	Mission
Diaz, Martin	Trade-Tech	Mathes, Mark	SAC
Echeverri, Angela	DAS	Pai, Ed	Harbor
Endrijonas, Erika	President’s Rep	Pearl, Maury	ESC
Gallegos, Alfred	Southwest	Stewart, Robert	Southwest
Gonzalez, Roberto	West	Wardinski, Steve	East

The minutes of the February 23, 2018 meetings were reviewed and approved.

**Review of Recommendations for Implementation of DSP**

Ryan reviewed the compilation of DSP priorities. He noted that the list of priorities would be circulated to District committees and constituencies and feedback would be obtained. In addition, it would be expected that these priorities would be integrated into college planning. Sarah asked if that the objectives were listed in priority order and, if not, to list them that way. Maury will check on this and send out a corrected list, if necessary. Ed asked if efficiency and effectiveness measures could be also be listed in the priority listing. The metrics are listed in the strategic plan summary and can be added to the priority summary.

**Integration of DSP and College Plans and Tracking**

Ryan inquired as to where colleges were in their planning cycles and if they anticipated making changes using the recently developed priorities. College can report on this at the next or a future meeting. It was suggested that reporting to the Board be based on the annual priorities and software solutions might be explored to facilitate tracking of progress on these objectives. Erika noted that current reporting on the strategic plan is based on goal alignment and detailed reporting via a standardized template and does not require tracking software. Sheri suggested that a rubric could be developed and applied to in reporting on plan progress. Ed inquired about the provision of annual data on metrics to assess progress. Maury noted that the current detailed strategic plan reporting template, which data for the plan measures, could be used to focus on annual priorities and that a separate annual summary or scorecard could be developed for all strategic plan objectives. In response to a question from Ed, Ryan stated that the strategic priorities could change over time and that this would be considered after assessing progress on the initial set of priorities.

**Update on State Budget Allocation Model**

Ryan reported that development of the new state budget allocation model was currently at an impasse as different groups studied and weighed-in on specific elements and data associated with the formula. The statewide CBO and CEO groups are continuing to review the model and have made recommendations. Erika noted that funding simulations showed that there were big winners and losers under the new model making it politically difficult to accept and therefore unlikely to reach consensus for July 1 implementation. The CEO group has made additional recommendations for student success, which may be difficult to implement due to data limitations. Regarding the implementation timeframe, the state model guarantees that institutional funding would be held harmless for two years. Erika reported that the CEO group wants full implementation with seven years, which would make the student success component problematic. Ryan expected the CBO group to release their draft funding simulations soon, noting that these could be influenced by who was actually running the simulation (e.g., Department of Finance). He thought that more would be known by the time of the governor’s May Revise. Erika stated that the governor’s position would key to getting the model implemented, but that it would have to appear to not punish districts in order to be politically acceptable. She mentioned that another operative factor was that the CEO and CBO groups were competitive and focused on different aspects of the model, with the CBOs being less focused on the student

success factors. Cross-conversations between these groups and the state Vice Chancellor of Finance have not yet occurred and could help reconcile and reach consensus on each groups recommendations.

**Committee Evaluation**

The committee agreed to distribute the survey which will be used for the committee evaluation. Data collected from the survey will be analyzed and brought to next month's meeting for discussion.

**Next Meeting:**

Friday, April 27, 2018, 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, ESC