



Strategic Planning Advisory Council

March 9, 2006

2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Rio Salado College, Room 515

Members: Teresa Toney, Earl Monsour, Jamie Moore, Gaye Murphy, Jane Saldana-Talley, Maria Harper-Marinick, Jeanne, Jean, Linda Rosenthal, Sue Tavakoli, Linda Thor, Pat Case, Daniel Marashlian (for Pat Honzay), Janet Ortega, Mike Metzger, Debbie Thompson, Georgia Gudykunst, Steve Helfgot

Guests: Matt Ashcraft, Rene' Willekens

Welcome & Introductions.

Debbie welcomed everyone to this session of SPAC. Debbie introduced Larry Christiansen, to speak to the Higher Learning Commission as context for self-assessing our respective colleges, followed by Matt Ashcraft speaking about Noel Levitz use at GCC, and Rene' Willekens and Jane Saldana use of CCSSE at EMC and PVC respectively.

Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Changes in the Criteria for Accreditation

Larry defined accreditation as defined by HLC, emphasized why accreditation is important, and the general process. He then focused on the "Five Criteria Approach" and compared the new criteria against the old criteria. The focus has shifted to: having Mission focus on integrity; planning for the future (which includes preparing for a changed future and aligning planning with the college's mission); student learning and effective teaching; acquisition, discovery, application of knowledge; and identifying its key stakeholders and serving them in ways that both the college and community value.

Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory.

Matt highlighted some ways in which GC used the inventory to improve services that are important to students and to identify how satisfied students were with each service. For example, they are remodeling the student center to reflect student concerns. They also just expanded the available number of parking spaces by 600 to better accommodate students when they drive to campus. The tool enables a review of the performance gap, between importance and satisfaction with each service.

CCSSE.

Rene' informed the group that EMC uses both the Noel Levitz and the CCSSE, alternating their administration. He focused on the CCSSE and how they shared the student survey results with their campus and with their stakeholders. They have effected some changes - such as working with faculty to create different types of learning spaces for classroom space, similarly, to create learning spaces in the library.

Comment on Survey Tools. These tools serve different purposes, and enable benchmarking to national results for that purpose. There is another survey that is very useful as well, out of North Carolina. A question was asked whether there are any financial or budget benchmarking tools and resources to pay for these. Georgia responded that two colleges were interested in working on it as a pilot but the initial volunteers had to pull back for awhile (administrator illness, working on self-study); they are still very interested in piloting in 2006-7. CGC expressed interest in serving as a possible pilot college.

As a note, the VP's of Administrative Services submitted a request to the 2006-7 DW fund—with the assistance of the district IE Office, and requested funds to support the use of several different tools by the Maricopa colleges. Examples included institutional effectiveness indicators benchmark (NCCCBP), eventual instructional productivity and costs benchmark, and student feedback on services and connectedness. Results will be announced later this spring.

Group Activity. Enrollment Opportunities and Challenges: SWOT

Pat Case led the group to consider external factors that may be impacting MCCC'D's enrollment - notably "threats" from external. Also, consider internal Maricopa process/procedures that may impact Maricopa's enrollment. An environmental scans list -- of some key challenges on the national, state and local scene - was provided to serve as a prompt. The group then began with threats from the external environment, and also noted procedures that we used that either created barriers or facilitated student access to/for enrollment. It was recommended that we work collaboratively on some key areas - removing barriers, marketing the MARICOPA Colleges, etc. The SPAC group plans a follow-up by the next meeting. (The flip chart notes will be typed up and distributed.)

Next Meeting for SPAC. May 3, 2006