Designing and Documenting a Clear Process for Decision-Making at MJC

March 26, 2012

The Decision-Making Task Force met for a two hour Compression Planning Session to identify the priorities and basic structure of the MJC Decision-Making Document. Four specific questions were asked of the group. All ideas were captured without discussion of strengths or weaknesses of the idea. Recorders wrote ideas on 4 x 6 cards which were posted on large boards for a visual record of the discussion. Following the listing of all ideas, the group identified the top priorities under each of the four questions by individually placing “dots” on the cards seen as most critical.

There was general consensus that a single process would not address all decision-making. Rather an overall process with “sub-processes” would address the multiple decisions at the college. All processes should be illustrated by a simple visual model.

Questions Asked:

1) What basic resources should be included?
2) What decisions have college-wide impact?
3) What processes and visual models need to be developed?
4) What elements should be incorporated into all processes?

The following members of the Task Force participated (please add names I missed):

Brenda Thames  VP, Student Services (Chair)
Maurice Mckinnon  Dean, Allied Health, Fire Science, Family and Consumer Science
John Zamora  Academic Senate President Elect
Allan McKissick  Academic Senate Secretary
Deborah Bolter  Faculty
Cece Huddleson-Putnam  YFA
Martha Robles  Dean, Admissions and Matriculation
Nora Seronello  Research Analyst
Doug Dryssen  ASMJC President
Kevin Sabo  ASMJC
James Varble  ASMJC
Flerida Arias  Guest
(Jenni Abbott)  Facilitator

Ideas generated are shown in the table below. They are listed in prioritized order as Task Force members identified them.
## Resources and Processes to Include in Decision-Making Document (in prioritized order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>What Decisions Have College-wide Impact</th>
<th>What processes and visual models should be developed?</th>
<th>What elements should be incorporated into all processes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Existing resources to link in plan)</td>
<td>• Issues related to 10+1 and 9+1</td>
<td>• Program Discontinuance and viability</td>
<td>• Consistent approach to data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ed Codes: 1726; YCCD 4103; Title V – 53200, 5103; YFA Contract; CSEA Contract; LTAC guidelines</td>
<td>• Charge of Committees</td>
<td>• Program Review model (process in place, needs review)</td>
<td>• Clear description of what is communicated and to whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MJC Mission and Values</td>
<td>• Process of each committee, its flow and strength of recommendations</td>
<td>• Resource allocation, including hiring prioritization</td>
<td>• A visual model of the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constituent Governmental Documents</td>
<td>• Resource Allocation</td>
<td>• Hiring process when there are exceptions to regular Resource Allocation process</td>
<td>• An opportunity for all individual stakeholders to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Master Plans: Facilities, Strategic, Technology, DE</td>
<td>• Course Scheduling</td>
<td>• Strategic Planning</td>
<td>• A process (ombudsperson) to address unresolved concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Committee Charges</td>
<td>• Accreditation</td>
<td>• Facilities Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal opinions for laws cited</td>
<td>• Institutional Grants</td>
<td>• Enrollment Management review (process and committee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center of Excellence link</td>
<td>• Programmatic Grants</td>
<td>• Review of Decision-Making Process (College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HR Info and guidelines</td>
<td>• Events: Commencement, outside organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Resources to be collected or developed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Committee member and leader roles
- New topics and recent updates
- Glossary of terms
- FAQs
- Descriptive narrative of decision-making process
- History of the development of the document
- Identification of data sets for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Technology Acquisition Model (see Tech Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic and Professional Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual model of combined processes (charts &amp; sub-charts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff development process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:

Twelve areas were identified for further process development. While all decisions should follow a logical and similar course, some may fit into a specific committee’s purview and charge while others require more comprehensive review.

The decision-making process of each committee, as well as the strength of its recommendations regarding campus-wide decisions should be determined. Each of these “sub” processes should feed logically into the overall college decision-making model.

Multiple resources were identified to inform and clarify decision-making. The group thought a “living document” with live links to these resources would be more effective than simply a written handbook.

There may be other Master Plans and/or committees that should be included in this process. Some may be in development or will be in the future.

A simple visual model should be developed for each process.

An ombudsperson process was discussed to address unresolved concerns.

Processes and models should be explored in these areas:

- Program Discontinuance and viability
- Program Review model (process in place, needs review)
- Resource allocation, including hiring prioritization
- Hiring process when there are exceptions to regular Resource Allocation process
- Strategic Planning
- Facilities Decisions
- Enrollment Management review (process and committee)
- Review of Decision-Making Process (College Council)
- Technology Acquisition Model (see Tech Plan)
- Academic and Professional Decisions
- Visual model of combined processes (charts & sub-charts)
- Staff development process

The flow chart below is not a decision-making model, but illustrates the major elements identified in the Compression Planning Session that contribute to the process. (Lots of information here. It can certainly be refined.)
Elements Contributing to a Comprehensive Decision-Making Process