



Strategic Planning Steering Team

March 1, 2007

1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Rio Salado College, Room 6D

Members Present

Jean Abel, Pat Case, Lionel Diaz, Christine Hall, Linda Hawbaker, Damita Kaloostian, Earl Monsour, Nancy Osborne, Janice Reilly, Jane Saldana-Talley, Donna Silber, Debbie Thompson, Linda Thor, Teresa Toney, recording-Judy Holley.

Review of February Meeting Minutes

The team reviewed and approved the February minutes.

Environmental Scanning

Damita reviewed the history of the 2006 Environmental Scanning process. The team compiled a plus/delta list on last year's environmental scanning process:

Plus

- Involved collaboration
- Information was good and useful
- August delivery works

Delta

- No criteria for source evaluation – inconsistent ‘credibility’
- All personnel involved were IR staff
- Need better standards for which topics should be included
- Need to clarify who the scan represents – MCCCCD? Just the participating colleges? Perhaps omit the participating college names from the cover.
- Need broader participation by the colleges (all colleges?) Is it important that all 10 participate? If yes, perhaps CEC should move this forward as a directive.
- Clarify what role the participants would have and what would be required of them
- Possibility of adding more ‘target’ data on different areas of the value if more resources were available
- Document the process and timelines involved in the scanning process

Wiki Software

Damita distributed a matrix that compared the options of the different wiki's available. Nancy demonstrated the Brainkeeper wiki software. The following comments were made during the demonstration:

- Would the environmental scan report completion date still be in August if we used the Brainkeeper? The group agreed that probably would work, but maybe we need to survey to the colleges about their planning cycles.
- How will the timeline change if all colleges participated? We would need to develop a timeline for participants to follow.
- It would be extremely useful if links were available on the web to share the information created.

- Should we be sharing the IR council minutes with other groups and letting them know they are posted on the web every month? It did not seem that all of the appropriate individuals were made aware of the opportunity to participate in last year's environmental scan.
- Different instructional councils could participate and each council could share their login among themselves.
- This could allow for many more participants other than SPST to join in and collaborate together.
- This could be a great opportunity for MCCCCD to polish our image of working together and being an innovative institution.
- This could really gain some interest from different council's within MCCCCD to participate in more processes.
- What is the role of SPAC in this? We could use them SPAC to discuss emerging trends and issues that could affect Maricopa.
- We could tie this into the instruction area of our colleges. We could capture this information and share it with a broader audience.
- The team was very interested in an Enterprise package for multiple users, moderators, etc.
- Could people make a blog and connect it to Brainkeeper? Could we put a link to a blog for people to make comments on what they were seeing?
- The team really liked the source function that is built into Brainkeeper. Verifiable source data is very important.
- We should use last year's environmental scan data as a starting point.
- The IE researchers will demo Brainkeeper to SPAC during the March SPAC meeting and get answers clarified.
- Maybe we could use a computer lab during the April SPAC meeting to have SPAC participate in a hands-on session with Brainkeeper.
- We need the wikipedia rules of engagement to get started. Please bring to the SPAC meeting.

FOLLOW UP ON ITEMS FROM NOVEMBER RETREAT ASSIGNED TO SPST

NCCBP

Damita distributed a document titled "Maricopa Community Colleges Comparison of Community College Districts" and gave a summary of the data.

- Who are our Peers?
- All MCCCCD colleges are participating in this year's NCCBP submission.
- Would it be interesting to have data on the cost per credit hour?
- You have to have at least five peers to be able to get a peer report from NCCBP.
- We could contact some of our peers and offer to share and collaborate together.

Use of National Benchmarks

A document titled "National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) Data Reporting Discussion" was distributed. There was general agreement at this year's Governing Board Retreat that we should use benchmarks. There was concern, however, about the small number of institutions participating in NCCBP, our ability to find valid peers for MCCCCD as a whole, and

some interest in comparing our colleges to district as a whole. There are three options for MCCCCD data comparisons:

- Option 1 - Compare District to National Benchmark
- Option 2 - Compare District to National Peers
- Option 3 - Compare Colleges to MCCCCD as a whole

The IR Council met on 2/21/07 and agreed that national benchmarking is critical to expanding what we can already know internally. It is a “value added”. They also saw an on-going trend of comparisons becoming more public. For the next NCCBP submission period, all 10 colleges will participate for the first time. We will still submit data for the district as a whole, but will modify two of the indicators to aggregate the data by district – not by college:

- Fall-to-Spring-to-Fall persistence (persist at any college from term to term)
- Transfer to University (12+ MCCCCD hours instead of 12+ hours from a college)

The IR Council recommendations were:

- Continue to participate in NCCBP (Option 1)
- Promote the use of NCCBP with peers (Option 2)
- Explore option of sharing district data with peers (Option 2)

The team agreed with the IR Council’s recommendations. Participating in NCCBP provides a different way to view information and we can look for trends and see if we need to look further and if we should take any actions for improvement. We need to step up to the plate and look at what we do and how we can improve our programs and processes. These types of surveys allow us to identify best practices. The next step would be to do some additional research the on peers proposed and then we could decide who we would select to benchmark with. Additional information was requested on percent of developmental students, full-time/part-time differences, and number of awards (percent degrees vs. certificates).

Agenda for next SPAC meeting:

1. Brainkeeper demonstration and gather information on their feedback.
2. Give overview of the beginning of the environmental scanning process and break into groups and have participants respond to the questions Nancy posed to the team today during the demo of Brainkeeper.

Other Topics of Interest

- Teresa noted that we don’t have outcome statements for Civic Participation and Global Engagement. What do we mean by these terms and when do we plan to work on developing the statements for them? Should we have a different committee work on this task? Maybe the Civic Participation Group should work on this project. Does the Civic Participation Group think these should be a part of our mission? What are the expected outcomes that would give guidance, should we do it and how do we know that we have accomplished it?
- What about the issue of the drop in high school enrollment? Have we looked into this? Maybe Damita can get some data on enrollment numbers. Is this due to AIMES?

ACTIONS:

- 1) Damita will provide more information on Enterprise pricing for Brainkeeper to the SPST members.
- 2) Damita will find out how and if data can be retrieved if someone other than the person who originally inputted the information deleted it.
- 3) Damita will contact the Department of Education to see if we can get more data on enrollment trends.
- 4) Damita will get additional information requested about peers
- 5) Nancy will check to see if individuals could connect to an external blog from Brainkeeper.

Next Meeting: Thursday, April 12, 2007 from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m., Rio Salado College, Room 6A