

## Strategic Planning Process

### **Team Member Evaluation**

Preliminary Results (4/3/08)

17 out of 46 respondents (37% response rate)

*The process we used to develop the 2008-2012 RCC Strategic Plan was new. Your feedback about what worked and what could be improved will help us do a better job in the future. Thank you for your contribution to the process and for your thoughts on the evaluation. – Team Facilitators Midge, Denise, Paul, and Mary*

Name (optional): \_\_\_\_\_ Team (circle one) A: 5 B: 0 C: 3 D: 7 None Given: 2

#### **1. Select the strategic planning elements below that were the more useful or interesting to you and why. (check all that apply)**

10 Mission statement

9 Vision statement

10 Values statement

10 Strategic Challenges for RCC

10 Goals & Objectives

1 Other: The chance to interact with fellow colleagues I don't normally get much of a chance to have frank discussions with.

#### **Why:**

- a. I found it all very interesting—each piece fitting with the next. I can't wait to see the final product.
- b. The strategic challenges and goals/objectives were the most practical in relation to what actions we might take.
- c. The strategic challenges and goals/objectives seem more practically connected to daily issues.
- d. I think it is important for all value statements (& the mission and vision) to mean something to RCC and be integrated into the way we do business from the top down.
- e. The mission statement was the piece most important to me as it is important to live. As most in the process came to know, I had worked where it (the mission) was on the back of our business cards. I also loved the new vision.
- f. All good!
- g. The whole process was empowering and inclusive!
- h. Interesting to see what others felt the role of the college should be.
- i. I like working on the big picture.
- j. It was a chance to hear there was agreement around the challenges the College is facing.
- k. I liked the process and the contributions that each member made. It was interesting for me to see how much alignment there was in the group. I also like the final mission statement.
- l. We should have spent the entire process trying to make tangible goals and trying to get concrete tasks completed.
- m. These were all an important part/critical elements of the process. I liked the way the process was broken down so that we grappled with each of these as we went along.

**2. Were there any elements you found to be a waste of time & why? (check all that apply)**

- Mission statement
- Vision statement
- Values statement
- Strategic Challenges for RCC
- Goals & Objectives
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Why:**

- a. I really hoped we'd come away with actual work done in the areas of taking employee recommendations and doing something with them. Staff is sick of time wasted on mission and goal statements.
- b. The mission, vision and value statements always take up too much time in relationship with concrete plans. Still do them, but limit the time allocated to decide on changes.
- c. It seems like we needed to cover all of these issues – interconnected. (Could also apply to #1)
- d. Felt like they are all important. (Could also apply to #1)
- e. None!
- f. I missed a lot of the sessions, but from the ones I attended I didn't feel that there was wasted time. In fact, I thought we came up with good ideas quickly.

**3. How would you evaluate the following strategic planning processes and tools? (1-5; 1 poor, 3 average, 5 excellent; NA – not applicable or did not use)**

- Team meetings
- Team retreats
- "All RCC" e-mails about the strategic planning process & results
- Strategic Planning Web-Page listing our minutes
- Strategic Planning Discussion Boards to give/receive feedback

	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
<b>Meetings</b>	13	1	2			1
<b>Retreats</b>	8	6	3			
<b>Emails</b>	2	3	8	1		2
<b>Web-Page</b>	3	1	3		2	8
<b>Disc. Bds</b>	1	1	3		1	10

**Comments:**

- a. It doesn't feel like e-mails to all of RCC were even opened by most staff I spoke with. Web-Page minutes were completely ignored. Team meetings had some value to the team members.
- b. I think some of the emails contained too much information that changed quickly. Consequently, we were sometimes printing information that would become outdated right away. Maybe put in the non-critical emails "for information only – you don't need to print."

- c. The meetings were good but better if all members attend consistently. Maybe shorten but intensify – could simplify membership attendance.
- d. The retreats should have been longer.
- e. The face-to-face interaction was good—brought up new ideas and understanding.
- f. Since I was part of the process, I did not utilize (emails, discussion boards, web-page) these enough to rate them.

**4. Give us some suggestions about how we could have made your time on the team easier, more time efficient, or just a better overall experience.**

- a. Meeting organization was fine. The wasteful part is that no concrete solutions made it to the final process.
- b. Sometimes, it was a little difficult to be creative and to write at the end of a late afternoon meeting. I would try to do those activities right after a break or at the beginning of the meeting. I realize that might sometimes be hard to do because a sequence is being followed. Thank you!
- c. Well, (because I volunteered late in the process) I was only able to attend to the retreats but I had a great experience. I wish I could have been part of the whole process.
- d. Maybe make this a 2-3 day process. Reading the notebook could have been included.
- e. More commitment on the part of team members to be there every time. Some assigned to our team (student & 1 manager) never attended. Sometimes we were down to 3-4 members out of 10.
- f. It was fine. I could have had a better brain, but you have what you get.
- g. It was all good.
- h. I am happy with the way the process was developed and initiated. There was a lot of background planning that helped streamline the process. Overall, it was a very productive, and effective experience. I was glad to participate.
- i. Facilitated team activities were a big help. I sometimes had trouble tracking the purpose of an exercise. I am not a good soundboard because of my poor attendance due to conflicting schedules.
- j. I thought the storyboarding worked well and made an efficient use of meeting time—I can't really think of other suggestions.

**5. Other comments:**

- a. Staff feels disenfranchised by “fluff” meetings that don't go anywhere. In-service comment cards accomplish something if they are acted upon.
- b. I really enjoyed this process. The level of discussion and participation was high. It was great to work with colleagues I do not usually interact with. Thank you for making this process available to us. I feel proud to be working with such a great group of people. Kudos to our fearless facilitator, Mary O’Kief!
- c. I had no time for this and my regular job.
- d. All good.
- e. Next time (at the retreats) we should get to the detailed level of plans sooner. Longer retreats are ok if needed.
- f. Thought this was a good process—would like to have a copy of the final draft when everything is done.
- g. I appreciate all the efforts that went into planning of each team meeting and the retreats, etc. That was essential to our level of productivity.
- h. Mary did an excellent job of being organized and keeping our team on task. I felt it was a good use of time and very productive considering the reality of the small amount of time we actually had together. The combined retreats were good;

however, the time seemed too short. It would have been good to get a more in-depth feel for what was behind some on the comments. Yet, on the other hand, if you make them too long, people won't come or lose interest. Unfortunately, I can't think of a solution for that one. ☹

- i. I really liked the cross-section of management, faculty, classified, community, and student on our team. The process was richer for it. I enjoyed being part of the process—thanks for you great facilitation, Mary!