



Strategic Planning Advisory Council
April 25, 2007
2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Rio Salado College, Conference Center

Members: Jean Abel, Pat Case, Jeanne Christen, Lionel Diaz, Linda Hawbaker, Steve Helgot, Jim Moore, Gaye Murphy, Linda Rosenthal, Jane Saldana-Talley, Steve Schenk, Debbie Thompson, Linda Thor, Teresa Toney, Ruth Unks, Renée Young, Judy Holley–recording.

Guests: Matt Ashcraft, Jan Binder, John Catapano, Laurie Cohen, Mary Day, Georgia Gudykunst, Linda Hughes, Damita Kaloostian, Sue Kater, Laurie Pemberton, Christina Santacruz, Vernon Smith, Sue Starrfield, Genevieve Winters.

Welcome

Debbie Thompson welcomed everyone and shared that our agenda will be focusing on using BrainKeeper for environmental scanning.

Environmental Scanning

Report back by members. Pat

Damita responded to questions raised by the group on how information posted in BrainKeeper can be marked for specific colleges, councils, etc. The 'tagging' feature in BrainKeeper allows one or more tags to be placed on information posted to the wiki. A search on the tag can then be conducted. This would bring up any information in the wiki that has been coded with a specific tag. Additional information reported back included:

- PVCC is going to pilot the initial environmental scanning process using BrainKeeper.
- Linda Hawbaker encourages other colleges to participate in the Pilot process as well. We will learn from this Pilot so that the final rollout of the process includes lessons learned.
- There has been an extremely positive response so far as to the BrainKeeper wiki usage.
- This is a resource that we can place sabbatical reports and research information to further facilitate sharing information.
- There is a plan to inform the instructional councils of our process.
- BrainKeeper has an RSS feed that can give users information they seek.
- Can we do a rating on this information to determine whether or not it is useful?
- This will be a good resource to show other community colleges that we are working together collaboratively and that we are sharing our human capital.
- How do we account for quality control? We have set up tentative training that addresses the rules of engagement and determining use of credible sources. Rio has provided the IE Department with their rubrics to learn how best to determine a credible source.

EScan calendars. Linda Hawbaker

Linda reviewed the pilot and annual EScan calendars with the council.

Broader participation. Debbie

Debbie shared the potential direction to expand the participants in this process and include FEC and the Presidents Councils in future discussions.

- Dr. Helfgot suggested that we include the SOAR people and the individuals who do outreach and recruitment. It would be valuable to hear from the Marketing and Public Relations departments as well.

Review guideline documents. Damita

Damita reviewed the rules of engagement and determining credible sources documents that were distributed to the council. Damita has been working with Hazel at Rio and has developed a process to ensure that the posting information to BrainKeeper complies with copyright. A document outlining this process has been created and will be distributed as part of the upcoming training to participants.

Group Activity

The council reviewed the rules of engagement and determining credible sources documents and brainstormed their ideas on how to improve or clarify these documents.

Group Activity

The council reviewed the rules of engagement and determining credible sources documents and brainstormed their ideas on how to improve or clarify these documents.

Group 1 Suggestions:

Rules of Engagement Document

- Need clarification on the “amend and edit” section
- Under the “Be positive” bullet
 - Negative and cautionary items that lead to problems need to be included
 - Points should be professional/academic (as alternative?)

Determining Credible Sources

- The checklist items seem geared toward students – this may not be as relevant for our tasks

Comparison of Community College Districts Document

- Need to add FTE to data

Group 2 Suggestions:

- Move positive guidelines up to front of document
- Reword as positive rather than negative statements
- Put positive conditions (MCCCD) at top of document, followed by the BrainKeeper legal requirements
- Expand on purpose statement to include:
 - Collaboration – scanning externally
 - Differing views – Why are we doing this?
- Add question – Why is this useful to MCCCD?
- Add org with author bullet points
- Try to identify bias or advocacy

Group 3 Suggestions:

Rules of Engagement Document

- Do not delete as a matter of principle... You may submit supportive alternative viewpoints
- Add “reasonable person” clause
- Make workforce lead(s) plural
- Wikacopa (Possible name)
- Add “Be concise” to synthesize statement
- Add the statement “agrees to adhere to Credible Sources Document”

Determining Credible Sources

- Establish standard/criteria if response is “Yes”. Do you use source?
- Invite Hazel Davis at Rio to a SPST meeting to speak about rules of engagement and credible sources

Group 4 Suggestions:

Rules of Engagement Document

- Put MCCCCD information at the top of the document
- Be positive – be objective

Determining Credible Sources

- Websites content – reasonable and verifiable = two different things
- Websites org. include bibliography/bullet citation
- Websites purpose:
 - add 2 bullets
 - balanced
 - objective

Group 5 Suggestions:

Rules of Engagement Document

- Communicate
 - Eliminate “try to”
 - Amend, edit (or offer a different perspective)

Determining Credible Sources

- How to operationalize the checklist?
- Training needs to include examples of rules
- Are leads required to go through the training?
- Online training
- Councils
- Constituency Groups
- Policy Groups
- Curr Councils
- Faculty – as a teaching/learning tool
- Employee orientation
- Employers/K-12/Chamber of Commerce
- Alert – pointer to – prompt to post

Benchmarks

Who Are Our Peers. Damita

Damita reviewed two documents with the group - a comparison of MCCCCD to other community college districts and systems in a variety of areas. Mary Day asked if we could include FTE on the Who Are Our Peers document. It was suggested to take off the reference to “only” in the document. It was suggested the documents be divided into two groups: NCCBP participants and non-participants.

Establishing Performance Targets. Debbie

We would like to strive to be at least at the national average. IPEDS has a peer analysis system. It was suggested that we examine the trends from IPEDS to see what comparisons are available, and possible add some of the IPEDS indicators to the process. What kind of comparisons are we using and for what purposes? We should look at ourselves in comparison of district to district. In terms of setting performance targets we might have to go down from the district level. Using NCCBP currently there are already ways to use the information to make some comparisons. Dr. Helfgot made a request that we make the document clearer to understand and review the terms that we use to understand the documents presented. Dr. Helfgot volunteered to meet with the necessary individuals to achieve this goal. The IR Council can make some suggestions with the summarized data to determine who our peers are and to establish our performance targets.

The meeting concluded with a plus/delta.

Plus	Delta
The meeting was efficient	Hearing difficult in this room-need to use microphones
Lively discussion	
Time well spent	
Materials and prep work for meeting were helpful and used good examples	
No report outs	
This council moves ahead	
Innovation – looking at different ways	

Next meeting for SPAC. August 29, 2007, 1:30 – 4:30, RIO Conference Center