

Strategic Planning Steering Committee

Meeting Highlights: 5/15/08, 3-5 p.m., TRC

Present: Brad Hicks, Roy Lindsay, Darlene Dart, Gregg Edwards, Sharon Davidson, Jarrod Goode, Peter Angstadt, Rand Hill, Mary O’Kief

Agenda

1. **Review Input:** Mary discussed that the plan had been reviewed by the RCC Board, the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Council, the Executive Council, and staff at 3 campuses. She also shared that the board has a 3-hour retreat set for 6/2 to go over the plan. She walked people through the places in the plan that reflect the board’s top 3 priorities and the two latest suggested changes following the Executive Council meeting on 5/12.
2. **Review the Current Plan:**
 - a. General comments
 - Roy thought it was a good plan but needs a tag line to pull things together that is inspirational, gives a sense of purpose, motivates staff, and could go on business cards.
 - Brad suggested using “Teach, Learn, Live”.
 - Peter thought there were too many objectives. He said we need an achievable plan. Greg noted that actually there were subsets to several objectives and that we should indent these. He and others noted that some objectives were really more operational in nature.
 - b. Mission Statement
 - Brad thought it was good though a little long.
 - c. Vision Statement
 - Gregg noted that he had some difficulty differentiating #1 and #3 but he liked 1, 3, 4, and 5. He felt that #2 was more a methodology.
 - However, Sharon noted that #2 relates to two goals.
 - d. Core Value Statements
 - Gregg noted that we have not defined the core values but rather illustrated the outcomes. We may choose to go back and write definitions as well.
 - e. Goals & Objectives

Goal A:

- Gregg pointed out that it would help if we indented the sub-points under A.1.
- He also noted that A.2 was an operational step.
- Several people thought that A.1.7 (Fosters sustainability at all levels) did not really say much.

Goal B:

- B.2 needs to be re-written. It sounds like an operational issue now.
- Indent B.3.1 through B.3.4

Goal C:

- C.2-C.4 are sub-sets of C.1

Goal D:

- D.2 and D.3 are sub-sets of D1

Goal E:

- One member thought marketing and partnering could be separated into two goals.
- Gregg thought E.5 could be moved to Goal A
- E.3 could be a sub-set of E.2. Consider moving both to Goal B.

3. Evaluation:

- a. **Please tell us your thoughts about RCC’s overall strategic planning process.**

What Worked?	What Could Be Improved?
Moved along well assisted especially by the Synthesis Team and Rand our word smith.	Tough to get college-wide input.
Steering Committee was effective: good diversity in the comment process, provided direction, alerted us to pitfalls, good comparison between private and public planning models	Too many objectives (note: indent sub-points).

Captured a lot of content.	Did we spend enough time talking about the “why” we do strategic planning? This would have helped us articulate what we wanted at the end of the day.
Felt connected.	
Good, fluid organization	
Felt confident of the work by attending the retreats.	
Student and other stakeholder input was valued.	
Created a model that worked in higher education and recommends that RCC prepare a treatise to share our model.	
Replicate this model in other areas at the college to get more participation.	
Idea: Using the “pep assembly” idea, invite all stakeholders to the kickoff of the plan. Do this away from your typical environment and do differently than your typical way of doing business. Might try this with the opening of the HEC. It also ties back to needing a tagline. Use the new RCC blog.	

b. The Steering Committee concept was new this year. Please tell us:

What Worked?	What Could Be Improved?
Concept was good. Good to bring in folks from outside the family.	Hard to coordinate the meeting schedule with members’ busy schedules.
The formation of the committee told stakeholders that their opinions counted.	The Steering Committee’s role blurred at times.
Variable effectiveness on keeping the group focused.	
Message to the members is that RCC was taking their input to heart – we listened to and valued their ideas.	Felt like they were sometimes being asked for their insights.

The committee asked the right questions.	
Length of meetings: the first meeting should have been longer with perhaps a meal; other meetings were fine.	
	One member thought the process seemed to last a long time and could have impacted his participation. Others felt like scheduling is always a challenge.

c. Please give us some feedback about the various tools and processes used:

1) Strategic planning notebook

- It was useful to get grounded in the process.
- It was helpful throughout the process as a reference point and helped me stay on track.

2) Steering Committee meetings (also see item “b” above)

- Scheduling is always a challenge.

3) Communication methods

- Good.

4) Retreats

- Good to hear the various perspectives.
- In future years we might consider allowing optional participation for the steering committee and board in attendance.

d. Other comments:

- Be sure to review the progress made and the relevancy of the objectives annually.
- Next time, consider polling the steering committee about their interest in using a blog as a communication tool. This group generally did not find it useful.
- Create a way to get stakeholder input about whether the strategic plan is working for them, too.
- Consider using a blog to get open-ended input from stakeholders.
- Use an evaluation/reflection retreat.
- For the roll-out consider using the “pep assembly” idea to encourage more staff to give their input.
- Keep staff part of the process.
- Strategy de-code: consider what has to be different to be successful? What are the critical issues? Impediments? Structure? This is another process and is needed to effectively move forward.

- Use the vision statement and distill the macro metrics for the whole plan which will help tell if we are making progress.
- Be sure to appreciate everyone involved in making the plan.
- The Medford Chamber uses a survey tool called zoomerang which RCC may use to survey employers, in the future.