

**Institutional Effectiveness Summit Day One
April 8, 2011**

Attendees: Cindy Hooper, Bruce Wagner, Keith Snow-Flamer, Sue Alton, Rachel Anderson, Barbara Jaffri, Geisce Lye, Anita Janis, Becky Blatnick, David Gonsalves, Crislyn Parker, Cheryl Tucker, Mike Cox, Brady Reed, Ahn Fielding, Jennifer Knight, Paul Hidey, Dan Calderwood, Anna Duffy, Roxanne Metz, Steve Stratton, Alan Kepner

Small group report outs organized into 5 major Interests

In response to the question: “What is important about an integrated planning process from your perspective?” each small group developed a list of interests about the integrated planning process at the college. The interests (● bulleted items) were reported out and organized into the following five major themes.

Efficient and Effective participation	Trust & Communication	Eval & feedback	Effective & Efficient Process	Flexibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How to engage people who are no longer engaged ● Has improved over the years, improved communication will improve the process ● Agreeing upon standardized meeting times to allow for full faculty participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How can we increase trust in the process ● Improving, stream-line ● Committee chairs write year-end report and effective summary on what happened during the year to be shared during convocation. Begin the year thinking about the planning and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reciprocal feedback ● We never get around to it ● Data / institutional research support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How to engage people who are no longer engaged ● Has improved over the years, improved communication will improve the process ● Agreeing upon standardized meeting times to allow for full faculty participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Safe boundaries ● The process should never be in stone ● How can decisions be made in a more timely process ● Something that will kill a process is allowing it to be circumvented can think of examples ● Decision

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review and revitalization • Agendas sent out and posted district-wide participation, process we have one • Designated 2 hours (i.e., accreditation) 	<p>end the year by reflecting on it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why if a process was decided on but was not followed at a board level 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review and revitalization • Agendas sent out and posted district-wide participation, process we have one • Designated 2 hours (i.e., accreditation) 	<p>making and how to govern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible the decision should be made at the level that it will be implemented.
---	--	--	---	--

Integrated Planning Summit Day Two

Friday, April 15, 2011

Attendees: Mike Peterson, Cheryl Tucker, Crislyn Parker, Lee Lindsey, Roxanne Metz, Rachel Anderson Jose Ramirez, Ray Kingsbury, Dan Calderwood, Steve Stratton, Hillary Reed, Sally Frazier, Justine Shaw, Anna Duffy, Allen Keppner, Paul DeMark, Cynthia Hooper, Tim Flanagan, Keith Snow-Flamer, Brady Reed, Melody Pope ,Anita Janis, Ed Buckley

Handouts: See separate attachments for handouts from the second day of the Integrated Planning Process summit

1. Mission Statement
2. Strategic Plan – Integrated Planning begins with the College’s Strategic Plan and Goals
3. Numbers of District employees by classification
4. Planning Committee representation by classification *
5. Hours spent in planning committee meetings *

** Numbers are derived from committee information published on Internal CR Web Home <http://inside.redwoods.edu/> These have not been confirmed by committee members.*

6. Diagram of Integrated Planning Process approved by College Council (3/2011)
7. Worksheets – Matrices of interests crossed with questions to be answered . One sheet focuses on the “boxes” and one on “lines”

Groups were given forty minutes, using the matrix content as conversation prompts, to discuss the planning committees and the information flow between committees.

Each group reported out the highlights of their conversations. These are recorded below.

Report outs

1. PR & BPC

Trust, communication

Analysis ↑ good

Missing

Finding information on the website– standardize information so it can be found easily-branded & consistent

Concerns: Trust and data →improving, not there yet, trusting the numbers

Afraid

Data will be used against people

Participation Re: Staff (Classified)

Staff swamped, guilty to join committee

Faculty – feeling like students aren't priority over doing committee work

*Time it takes to participate

2. AHA

Assessment planning

Forms being part of program review

PR & BPC

PR yielding few requests for amount of work-refine

Missing

Executive Summaries going to all & BOT

Put in evaluation and feedback – does information go where it needs to?

My CR website – final reports on web/not MyCR

BPC

Missing appropriate board procedure
Language not updated to reflect the work we do

3. EMC

Engagement and communication↑
Good timing on agendas↑
All in PDF doc/some like non-PDF

Participating Governance Documents

People need to hear things twice - through manager and through constituency group
Gives everyone a chance to hear things

Process

Mendocino and Del Norte sometimes need to do things differently than Eureka
How does what we do in Eureka cross over to other locations?
Distance Ed for Mendo and –DN, for example – doing own schedules works, changes at Eureka campus can have an impact ↓

4. Big Ideas

IPC-student representation lacking
Students need mentors to understand how things work
Groups should be able to pick their members
Planning coordinator needed
Subject specialist to provide information
Every committee
-charge -scope -authority
Impact of fewer numbers of people to participate on committees
Impact on people of all the committee work, not just IPC work

5. Lack of consultation between all interested parties

New

Before money gets used, go through process
Bond – New construction
Programs & grants not being worked throughout committees
Problems with circumvention of committee work
Example L105 not faculty or tech people involved

6. Whole college should see BOT goals

Educational Plan & Strategic Plan should drive the institution

BOT should take an interest in these goals; their goals are not always for the institution
Program review analysis should note/reflect the strategic plan

Planning agenda for program review

Feedback from program review committee – allows communication, where is the executive summary?

Clearly articulate executive summary and allow for feedback

Student success (ACCJC) summaries need to go through communication loop

7. Comments from Ed Buckley

1. We are 80% there in having IPC process
2. We know how to use data, we are open to improvements
3. Strategic Plan

Goals and objectives ok, don't really need to change

Please include a way to measure these

How do we know that we've achieved a goal without a "how to do it"

Include strategies in the strategic plan

Planning statements from strategic plan should like action format we use in program review

8. FPC

Additional information is needed on requests, please include author's name on requests, that allows for a feedback loop, allowing FPC to access outcomes for faculty requests

Co chairs should e-mail information back to people or host it to a posted list on the website

Zach's templates are good

9. EMC

Where does this analysis go to inform others of trend and data?

EMC needs data front loaded which allows for work to happen over the summer

Basic Skills Committee needs to be on the IPC flow chart

Program review committee data needs to go to the EMC

BOT goals should be a planning agenda for the IPC

Analysis of findings:

This analysis is done considering the five interests identified for integrated planning at the college.

Efficient & Effective Participation, Efficient & Effective Process, Trust & Communication, Evaluation & Feedback, Flexibility

- ✦ Streamline the processes related to integrated planning to increase efficiency & effectiveness
 - Agree on what issues are Integrated Planning issues
 - Agree on what issues are NOT Integrated Planning issues along with who and how will these issues be addressed. (e.g., emergency requests, new programs, grants, community education, business training)
- ✦ Standardize web/online communication
 - Publish all committee documents as both .pdf and .doc or .docx
 - Decide on location for information
 - Online committee work is done on MYCR and site is available to all constituents
 - Committee documents, reports, minutes posted to Inside Redwoods with notice of new postings sent to ALL
 - Common Calendar with all committee meeting information and agenda
- ✦ Standardize face to face dissemination of information
 - All information should be heard/presented twice
 - Information is heard/discussed within work groups
 - Information is heard/discussed within constituency groups
- ✦ Standardize committee information to include establishment or annual review of:
 - Committee charge linked to District mission and current strategic goals
 - Scope and authority/
 - Role in integrated planning process
 - Representation / membership
 - Agreements for participation, meeting conduct and decision making methods
 - Overall committee outcomes that are measurable
 - Annual plan and outcomes
 - Assessment plan and frequency of assessment
- ✦ Standardize committee requests & reports
 - Make them user and time friendly
 - Include assessment and outcomes in Program Review
 - Set clear evaluation criteria (i.e. trends, enrollments completions, goals)

- Give committees the information that they need for planning & decision making
 - One form with check boxes for BPC-EMC-FPC-Tech-Faculty & Staff requests
- Provide reports with meaningful feedback
- ✦ Include all interested parties in consultation
- ✦ Standardize feedback mechanisms for all committees- reporting forms, reported to whom?
- ✦ Develop trust in use and accuracy of data
- ✦ Update Board & Administrative policies to match IPP language
- ✦ Mendocino & Del Norte incorporated into reports & requests or complete separate reports/requests
- ✦ Consider a Planning coordinator
- ✦ Mentoring for student involvement (student leadership seminar?)
- ✦ Where and how to address Basic Skills planning, new initiatives
- ✦ Committee membership chosen mutually by constituents/ committee members
- ✦ Map all committees by constituents/membership (include AS & committees, CSEA, CRFO,) to assess efficiency
- ✦ Define overall planning flow versus internal request flows (like projector bulbs repairs, changes)
- ✦ Planning agenda based upon strategic goals (outcomes) Who sets the agenda?
- ✦ Requests handled that are not directly related to strategic goals & integrated planning. How is this done?
- ✦ Board of Trustees and Board goals located where in the process?

1. PR & BPC

Trust, communication
Analysis ↑ good

Missing

Finding information on the website— standardize information so it can be found easily-branded & consistent
Concerns: Trust and data →improving, not there yet, trusting the numbers

Afraid

Data will be used against people
Participation Re: Staff (Classified)
Staff swamped, guilty to join committee
Faculty – feeling like students aren't priority over doing committee work
*Time it takes to participate

2. AHA

Assessment planning
Forms being part of program review

PR & BPC

PR yielding few requests for amount of work-refine

Missing

Executive Summaries going to all & BOT
Put in evaluation and feedback – does information go where it needs to?
My CR website – final reports on web/not MyCR

BPC

Missing appropriate board procedure
Language not updated to reflect the work we do

3. EMC

Engagement and communication↑
Good timing on agendas↑
All in PDF doc/some like non-PDF

Participating Governance Documents

People need to hear things twice - through manager and through constituency group
Gives everyone a chance to hear things

Process

Mendocino and Del Norte sometimes need to do things differently than Eureka
How does what we do in Eureka cross over to other locations?
Distance Ed for Mendo and –DN, for example – doing own schedules works, changes at Eureka campus can have an impact ↓

4. Big Ideas

IPC-student representation lacking
Students need mentors to understand how things work
Groups should be able to pick their members
Planning coordinator needed
Subject specialist to provide information

Every committee

-charge -scope -authority

Impact of fewer numbers of people to participate on committees

Impact on people of all the committee work, not just IPC work

5. Lack of consultation between all interested parties

New

Before money gets used, go through process

Bond – New construction

Programs & grants not being worked throughout committees

Problems with circumvention of committee work

Example L105 not faculty or tech people involved

6. Whole college should see BOT goals

Educational Plan & Strategic Plan should drive the institution

BOT should take an interest in these goals; their goals are not always for the institution

Program review analysis should note/reflect the strategic plan

Planning agenda for program review

Feedback from program review committee – allows communication, where is the executive summary?

Clearly articulate executive summary and allow for feedback

Student success (ACCJC) summaries need to go through communication loop

7. Comments from Ed

1. We are 80% there in having IPC process

2. We know how to use data, we are open to improvements

3. Strategic Plan

Goals and objectives ok, don't really need to change

Please include a way to measure these

How do we know that we've achieved a goal without a "how to do it"

Include strategies in the strategic plan

Planning statements from strategic plan should like action format we use in program review

8. FPC

Additional information is needed on requests, please include author's name on requests, that allows for a feedback loop, allowing FPC to access outcomes for faculty requests

Co chairs should e-mail information back to people or host it to a posted list on the website

Zach's templates are good

9. EMC

Where does this analysis go to inform others of trend and data?

EMC needs data front loaded which allows for work to happen over the summer

Basic Skills Committee needs to be on the IPC flow chart

Program review committee data needs to go to the EMC

BOT goals should be a planning agenda for the IPC

College of the Redwoods
Integrated Planning Summit
Friday, April 15, 2011
10am – 12pm

In Attendance:

Mike Peterson
Cheryl Tucker
Crislyn Parker
Lee Lindsey
Roxanne Metz
Rachel Anderson
Jose Ramirez
Ray Kingsbury
Dan Calderwood
Steve Stratton
Hillary Reed
Sally Frazier
Justine Shaw
Anna Duffy
Allen Keppner
Paul DeMark
Cynthia Hooper
Tim Flanagan
Keith Snow-Flamer
Brady Reed
Melody Pope (via phone)
Anita Janis (via phone)
Ed Buckley (via phone)
Pat Girczyc
MaryGrace Barrick

Group 1: Steve Stratton, Dan Calderwood, Hillary Reed, Sally Frazier, Justin Shaw, Brady Wells

Group 2: Bruce Wagner, Ray Kingsbury, Jose Ramirez, Alan Keppner, Anna Duffy

Group 3: Melody Pope, Anita Janis, Ed Buckley

Group 4: Crislyn Parker, Lee Lindsey, Roxanne Metz, Cheryl Tucker, Rachel Anderson

Group 5: Paul DeMark, Mike Peterson, Keith Snow-Flamer, Cindy Hooper, Tim Flanagan

Themes

Efficient and Effective participation	Trust & Communication	Eval & feedback	Effective & Efficient Process	Flexibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to engage people who are no longer engaged • Has improved over the years, improved communication will improve the process • Agreeing upon standardized meeting times to allow for full faculty participation • Program review and revitalization • Agendas sent out and posted district-wide participation, process we have one • Designated 2 hours (i.e., accreditation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we increase trust in the process • Improving, stream-line • Committee chairs write year-end report and effective summary on what happened during the year to be shared during convocation. Begin the year thinking about the planning and end the year by reflecting on it. • Why if a process was decided on but was not followed at a board level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reciprocal feed back • We never get around to it • Data / institutional research support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to engage people who are no longer engaged • Has improved over the years, improved communication will improve the process • Agreeing upon standardized meeting times to allow for full faculty participation • Program review and revitalization • Agendas sent out and posted district-wide participation, process we have one • Designated 2 hours (i.e., accreditation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe boundaries • The process should never be in stone • How can decisions be made in a more timely process • Something that will kill a process is allowing it to be circumvented can think of examples • Decision making and how to govern • Where possible the decision should be made at the level that it will be implemented.

Institutional Effectiveness

Planning Summit

April 8, 2011

AT 103/104

COPY

NAME	DEPARTMENT
1 LEE LINDSEY	Admin Svcs
2 ANNA DUFFY	Fin Aid
3 Lynn Thiesen	Fin Aid/Veterans
4 Roxanne Nutz	Instruction
5 ALLEN KEPPNER	COUNSELING
6 DAN CALDERWOOD	<i>[Signature]</i>
7 Steve Stratton	Tech Services
8 Paul DeMark	Communication & Marketing
9 Geisco Ly	MENDO Center Dean
10 Becky Blatnick	Del Norte Campus Student Svcs
11 Ed Buckley	Accreditation Consultant
12 William Reed	HO/Teach
13 Mike Cox	HE/PE/Ath
14 Crislyn PARKER	Admin Asst, Instruction
15 Cheryl Tucker	Student Svcs - Special Programs
16 Paul Hidy	Automotive - Applied Tech
17 Kathie Goodlive	Admissions & Records
18 Barbara Jaffari	Information Sciences
19 Keith Snow-Flaumen	Student Services
20 Sue Atton	EOPS
21 Rachel Andersen	Instruction
22 Zach Delosco	IR
23 Cynthia Hooper	ART
24 Ron McQueen	Advising
25 Ann Fielding	HR/CO
26. Brady Reed	Counseling/Advising
27. Jennifer Knight	Counseling/Advising
28. Ujjwal K. Gonnami	Present (Part of the time)
29. Karen Nelson	Present

Planning Committees (look inside the boxes)	Efficient & Effective Participation	Trust & Communication	Efficient & Effective Process	Evaluation & Feedback	Flexibility	Parking lot
What is the work ?						
Who is involved in the work?						
How is the work done?						
Where is the work done?						
When is the work done?						

Information Flow (look at the lines)	Efficient & Effective Participation	Trust & Communication	Efficient & Effective Process	Evaluation & Feedback	Flexibility	Parking lot
Where does the work come from and where does it go?						
What is the outcome?						
How does the work flow?						
When is the work passed on?						
Who carries the work forward?						