2011 Planning Summit Evaluation

The 2011 Planning Summit covered three topics: 1.) Review the planning process survey results to suggest possible changes to the process; 2.) Align three institutional timelines; and 3.) Create metrics for the strategic initiatives.

1. *The planning process survey discussion focused on the need to improve awareness of the planning process and the role of stakeholders in the process; the need for greater involvement in the planning process for those who want to be involved; a need for greater transparency/communication of the outcomes from the planning process; and more training on the process.*

   What if anything was missing or should have been included in the discussion on the planning process?

   Send out materials in advance for participants to become familiar with the document, prepare questions, and formulate potential solutions. Advance receipt of the materials would have given students an opportunity to discover what Plan Builder is and how we use it.

   Next time try handing the results to participants and asking them to analyze the results in small groups. I think that you'd get a much more comprehensive analysis, more awareness (via active engagement), and more buy-in. Do not lecture or read out of the book.

   Perhaps we could highlight the places in the planning and budgeting process when collegial consultation is necessary, recognizing that collegial consultation is a process in which decisions are informed and shaped in part by the input of constituent groups. It should be clarified that collegial consultation is not a process where the constituent groups are simply informed about decisions.

   Possibly a discussion on what would be the best way to market/disseminate the process to make the biggest impact in terms of awareness and participation for those who want or need to be involved.

   I don't think anything was missing, it just needs to be implemented so that the stakeholders can see transparency/communication is working.

2. *The discussion to align the review of the Mission Statement and Strategic Initiatives on a five-year timeline that coincides with revision of the Comprehensive Master Plan was left unfinished.*

   Should further consideration of this topic be held PBC or disregarded?

   Moved as an item for PBC discussion, and convene/establish other Committees as needed to help complete the task.

I think that our mission statement should always hold steady, and our strategic initiatives need to change as frequently as our competition and the economy changes.

I would suggest that the assessment of Core Competencies be considered and used in the creation of the Strategic Initiatives and the Comprehensive Master Plan.

I think that making a longer timeframe may dilute the value of the Mission Statement and Strategic initiatives. These items need to be reviewed and reaffirmed every year.

The side discussion about all the different timelines merits some further thought.

3. *The topic of metrics was split into three subsections – SMART goals; metrics guiding questions; and the creation of metrics for the strategic initiatives.*

<u>SMART Goals</u>
Do you see the value of creating objectives that are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely?

Most definitely, only one way we can quantify what we wish to do and evaluate if we have done it or are in need to adjust the metrics in the next planning cycle.

I found this to be very useful and informative. Great value.

Absolutely; that approach seems much more logical and raises important issues that should be considered when preparing program, unit, or area plans.

Will you use SMART when developing your 2012-2013 plans this fall?

Yes, this technique was very helpful…this needs to be rolled out to everyone who is in charge of submitting a plan.

It could have been a little clearer that the SMART Goals related to the evaluation part of the goal, since we are using the SIs for our goals.

Do you anticipate showing others how to use the SMART method when developing their plan objectives?

Yes. Provide this training to everyone using Plan Builder.

2011 Planning Summit Evaluation

Metrics Guiding Questions
Did the guiding question provide you with enough information to handle the task of creating metrics? If not, what additional information would have been helpful?

Some example statements could be useful as some people interpret concepts differently.

I thought the questions seemed to confuse some people and it was hard to make clear what the bottom line outcome should be after the questions were distributed. I think most questions served as a way to get the conversation started, so perhaps it had mixed benefit. Next time include most of the same questions but make the outcome (develop ideas for metrics) prominent.

Yes, especially with my group. We answered each question and found it to be a valuable guide.

Yes, but what helped more was seeing examples.

It seemed we had a list of questions to help guide us, but were told we didn't have to use them so we did not use them.

Enough information was presented but more practice is needed.

It was a bit vague...which was evident by the variety of responses given. Clarity regarding what exactly we were being asked to do: identify relevant metrics, respond directly to the questions, etc.

The guiding question did provide enough information, but it wasn't understood by many people. Most of the groups did not understand the task and did not complete it in the way intended by the Summit leaders. I think a summary of what the groups' tasks were before the groups started would have helped. And example would have helped too. Provide a clear transition from SMART to metrics.

Creation of Metrics
Were the right people at the summit to work on the creation of metrics for the college's strategic initiatives? If not, who was missing?

Yes, but a different mix of people at each table might work better – ie have tables with faculty, staff and administrators so that all viewpoints and agendas are taken into account.

I don't know enough of the college to answer this question knowledgably. However, I'm not sure that the "right people" would have been invested in participation because of the top-down feel to the day.

Include part-time employees.

I think that all deans and directors should have been there.

The following should have attended the summit: key staff from the VP-AA office and division offices, management from Admissions and Records, Facilities (*invited to attend*), and Information Technology Services (*invited to attend*), and the curriculum chair (*invited to attend*).

Do you believe that the draft metrics are on the right track for others (Academic Senate, College Council, and PBC) to complete?

Yes, but the creation of other committees or sub committees to help them may also be of benefit.

I don't think enough real metrics were developed. I think other groups will have a fair bit of work to do to make meaningful metrics.

Other
Did you gain useful information at the summit?

Yes. The SMART technique.

Not much.

Some of the information was mildly useful. However, it didn't feel like a "Planning Summit"; it felt more like a four-hour lecture about how to write more specific goals.

How was the timing of each portion of the summit?

Provide an agenda to inform participants of the topics and the time for each topic.

Devote more time to exercise and discussion.

Too much time was spent on reviewing the metrics and not enough on creating the metrics. Time for developing the metrics could have been expanded.

The timing was broken up well and proportionally to how much time each section needed.

2011 Planning Summit Evaluation

What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Preview materials before summit, provide summary of what was achieved /decided after the summit, be more open to the advice/suggestions and not be dismissive of comments. Come up with concrete ideas/suggestions to serve as starting points and have people say why they might work or not.

Get better response rates to surveys instead of using these tiny samples to drive major decisions. Have faculty work with administrators to present the segments.

Personal introductions around the room. Food.

Roll this type of training out to everyone who has to produce a plan on Plan Builder.

The information is quite heady. I think that the sections could have been broken into smaller parts with more breaks.

More interactive analysis of results, more solicitation of participant input.

What should be addressed but is not being asked in this evaluation?

It would be great to have ASO involved with this whole process to give students input on Plan Builder.

The summit was incomplete.

I think we should have spent more time identifying and working on ways to improve on the tasks/perceptions that scored low on the surveys. This tells us more about why the process is working or not working for some…once you change perceptions through additional information sessions or training, more people will feel engaged and realize the value of the process.

I don't think that the name "Planning Summit" is accurate. To me, a planning summit entails a comprehensive analysis of information and active problem-solving; whereas, this meeting seemed like a way to get participants to give the leadership the answers they wanted. Maybe the summit needs to be longer if we want to achieve genuine problem-solving and collaboration.