

# Focus On 2014

A Foundation to Take the College to the Next Level

## **Paradise Valley Community College Focus on 2014 Town Hall World Café Discussion**

On September 2 and 10, 2010, Town Hall meetings were held to review the preliminary drafts from the Focus on 2014 work teams. Over seventy PVCC faculty and staff attended one of the two Town Hall meetings and provided input and comment. Listed below is a compilation of employee comments and feedback received.

### **Strategic Planning/APB - Feedback**

What I liked:

- I liked the report that Jeanne Franco is working on a new APB system.
- That the focus is on the skills and mix of skills.

What I would change, why and how:

- Please consider adding a “Town Hall” prologue for committee.
- We need more time to analyze this information. It is difficult to provide good feedback in such a short time period (Town Hall format).
- The time frame for each was much too short. If the intent was to just provide information about the Focus on 2014, it satisfied that. However, if thorough and in-depth feedback was intended, at least 4-5 hours should be set aside as a brainstorming session.

Additional things to investigate and/or consider:

- If the idea is to get “system thinkers,” we might want to open the STIC to other groups that aren’t representative. Can we identify community members or students who could help serve? They might provide “ultimate insight.”
- BOST is so important in decision-making process for the budget, yet it is such a small part of the organizational chart. I believe roles should be more accurately reflected in the chart.

Questions:

- How soon will the strategic planning team be identified?

Other: None listed.

## Focus on 2014 Page 2

### Strategic Planning - Discussion

- Good to have nimble SPST.
- Good to eliminate duplicate committees.
- Encompasses everything – not just what is critical at the time.
- SPST – term of committee members? Some roll over – some longer term. Re-evaluate on an annual basis. Look at skill sets. Some screening so people have key skills.
- What about “representative” model – not directly – need to have skills and look at college...
- Input from STIC’s:
  - Subject areas know information, currency, issues, etc.
  - Report – How to choose SPST – “job skills” are subjective...invite, elect, appoint.
- SPST:
  - A – Too open as to whom.
  - B – Move holistic “representative” of college.
  - A – Allows flexibility of membership based on skills in case B or C has no one in an “area” with skills.
  - B – The whole college is “represented “ rather than the possibility of an area/input left out.
  - Any option would be only partially representative.
  - A gives some flexibility to start. Hope that people in A have chosen with college in mind.
  - B may create more divisiveness because I think it represents areas.
  - Need some way to balance length of St. Plan.
  - Department Objective – creativity of department.
  - Adjunct Faculty involvement?
- SPST:
  - Faculty Senate President rotates each year.
  - B or C implies representative – may not be global.
  - If only skills then none work.
- Is there an option D or E?
  - Rio – StrengthsQuest – Who works well together? How to use for SPST selection?
  - E – Director of IE and then members based on skills.
- Democratic or Holistic?
- SPST:
  - A – not too comfortable because the same five people on “hallway.”
  - How to get new blood?
  - Good to emphasize systemic.
- B looks like too many faculty? Maybe reduce to one faculty at large. Could say Academic Affairs be non-faculty. What about Adjunct Faculty “representative” – may be the other “faculty at large?”
- Staggered terms.
- STIC – STIC people logo.
- Length – 3 years.
- Learning Week – open forum for input – standing session.

### **Focus on 2014 Page 3**

- APB.
- Transparency on BOST.
- Length of term.
- Consider PSA, MAT, Crafts etc.
- Length 3 years.
- Option B = organizational structure?
- Faculty or DC rotate via division “turn.”
- Some “long-term” membership for institutional knowledge – maybe 3 years but rotate so always some new and some “experienced.”
- Option C – more equitable. Faculty Senate President should be on committee – any option – listens to all faculty.
- Nomination? Self-nomination? Invited? Recommended?
- Option A - still needs to be broad views/representatives so not a political agenda.
- Option B - reduce number of faculty.
- Option C – add Faculty Senator or President. Senator may not rotate as often.
- Self-nomination indicates you want to do it. Re-invite if not enough self-nominate make sure not all of “one group.”
- College objective should be broad enough that anyone can fit rather than division/department and objective.

### **Strategic Planning - Questions**

Strategic Planning Steering Team composition: which of the options seems best? If you would make adjustments to the membership, what would they be?

- Option B.
- B seems to be the most concise and yet individuals from different groups are represented. Include M & O, PSA, MAT, etc.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B.
- Option B, however I have concerns about a 2-5 year commitment, which would not rotate the Faculty Senate President after 1 year. (and possibly division chair).
- Option A because this option is not based upon departments but based upon the job skills required. Must insure that cronism is not a part of a strategic planning committee.

Environmental Scan: Would you make changes in the Resource STICs and if so, what would they be? What other options are there for getting good environmental scan information?

- What is a recommendation committee?
- Add PSPP, EMT, Nursing programs to academic quality.
- It looks good.

## Focus on 2014 Page 4

Length of strategic plan: Do you see a strategic plan being 3 or 5 years? Why?

- 3 years to keep focus not constantly revising.
- Three years max as changes occur plus this is a good time commitment.
- 5 years is more time to organize and get something done.
- 3 years with a separate 5-year college plan.
- 5 years. It takes 5 years to really affect major change.
- 5 years – 3 years is too short.
- 2-3 years. Things change so rapidly – we have to be nimble.
- 3 years. 5 would be too difficult and too many variables.
- 3 years.
- 3 years. 5-year plans often are revised at 2-3 years anyway. In a dynamic environment with financial risk, let's get more done in a shorter time.
- 5 years: with the business of a short-staffed campus and the slowness of the DO bureaucracy 3 years is not realistic - only an ideal – flexibility must be embedded into the SP so unforeseen options can be accommodated.

Goals/Objectives: Do you think there should be the option of divisions/dept./unit objectives as well as college wide objectives? How would you suggest regular operational budget requests be handled in terms of goals and objectives?

- The divisions should identify goals and objectives as well as college objectives. If a division or program identifies objectives and requests funds to support these, they should be required to explain how they have met these goals/objectives.
- Yes! Divisions should just respond to their goals and objectives.
- Yes! These objectives are very specific.
- The budget requests should be aligned within the goals and address specific objectives supported by the college and divisions/departments.

Long-term planning: What suggestions do you have for responsibilities and membership of the 2 new long term planning committees: Financial Planning and Master Planning? Are there other long term planning committees that need to be considered?

- Several members should be on both committees.
- The 2 committees must have representatives that are critical thinkers not just representational of a department/ position/unit.
- Sustainability should be long-term planning.

Goals/Objectives: What tools would you like to see developed to help with goal/objective development?

- Follow-up! Identify what has been accomplished and what hasn't and why! What prevented these objectives from being met?
- Accomplishments, works in process, A to goals/objectives because of circumstances, report as to why things are not achieved.

## Focus on 2014 Page 5

### Out of Class Program Review - Feedback

What I liked:

- Alignment to HLC, may need to reconsider when HLC criteria change.

What I would change, why and how?

- Definition on page i of program review: “For the purposes of the PVCC program review process, a program has been identified as all departments, programs, and in some cases services within the divisions of student affairs and administrative services.

Additional things to investigate and/or consider:

- Be explicit about reviewing programs that cross unit boundaries. Page 7 – Add “add additional sections as necessary.” Pages 8-9 Add “add additional cohorts as necessary.” Consider – “add evaluation of cross-departmental interaction, influence and impact.”

Questions:

- How do smaller or “mini” academic “programs” fit into this model? For example, several academic areas have certificate “programs” and/or significant out of the classroom academic activities – eg. journalism, creative writing or theatre. Also, these “mini-programs” are tied to the academic health of the in-class experience. In addition, will program “heads” be able to use director titles officially? Even if no extra pay is provided, the director title is important to recruit/retain students and create a presence on the local, state and national level. Additionally, the issue of support staff for these programs has not been addressed. All of this may or may not relate to program assessment. So issues of assessment, budget, titles and support staff seems to be directly related to academic progress.

Other:

- If we eliminate the division of student affairs, much of the language of this document will need to be reconsidered.
- Not enough time today.

### Out of Class Program Review - Discussion

- Orientation Silos? Program Mission? Cross unit or departments? Units as department?
  1. Definitions
  2. Issue - bring departments together.
    - a. What are the objectives?
- Add evaluation of cross-department interaction, influence and impact.
- Need section/area for non-student serving units, ie. HR, facilities and technology, etc.
  - Take it seriously.
  - Needs teeth.
  - Change culture to accountability.
  - Great that someone reads it. What are metrics? Qualitative versus quantitative.
- Look at North Central?

## Focus on 2014 Page 6

- Formative Evaluation – Is data consistent?
- APB – Tie into or help.
- Program Review.
- May be depository of information.
- Tweak wording of Purpose on NP Proposal Form.
- APB – Program Review a challenge.
- Academics does not do budget requests.

## Institutional Effectiveness - Feedback

What I liked:

- None listed.

What I would change, why and how:

- Having director and coordinator seems to limit the number of “worker bees” to actually assist with the assessment.
- These positions should not only be providing the research and support to programs, but it is imperative that there is follow-up and specific feedback in a timely manner. This has not been accomplished. Strong ideas are only beneficial if they can be implemented!

Additional things to investigate and/or consider:

- None listed.

Questions: Wouldn't a director and 2 “worker” bees with assessment background be a better model than 2 “chiefs?” It would be the same cost for staffing.

Other: None listed.

## Institutional Effectiveness - Discussion

- Institutional Effectiveness - Define purpose clarity – simple.
- Broken systems – HR.
  - Campus/direct.
- IE work with/communicate with STIC's. All work together!
- What data is available?
- Be data experts. Data/skills to support program review.
- Future student data.
- Data dictionary.
- Dashboards and archival data (must be in user friendly format).
- Consultation on design of assessment tools (planning).
- Draw and communicate existing student data – satisfaction. Reasons for access to raw data – (how and who) useful format.
- Sufficient personnel in IE?
- Member do strategic planning steering team. Chair lo-chair continuity.
- Stable physical location – where IE belongs. Where is that? Centrally located/accessible.

## Focus on 2014 Page 7

- Provide “follow up.” Do what they say and provide promised data.
- Action – provide support product.
- Define “coordinate” on doer versus teller.
- Be a worker/working director coordinator
  
- Proactive help/assistance/data to STIC’s groups from the beginning (accurate). Plan projects/assessments.
- SWOT training for individuals (groups) to help develop research questions.
- Articulate basics of IE to all in understandable language.
- Educate about function and purpose of IE. Be a teacher of what IE is.
- Knowledge of/experience in HLC would process requirements.
- Efficiency is key.
- More folks in IE. Post bullet list to website.

## Organizational Structure - Feedback

What I liked:

- I do not like the proposed structure. There is a reason most colleges divide administration between Academics, Student Services and Business Services. The proposed structure will overload 2 vice presidents and put departments into competition that normally don’t have such competition.
- Thorough and objective. Draft of organizational chart; this organizational chart would be an improvement.
- Perhaps more cost effective and moves the VP’s to the next level through new dean to handle former VP elements.
- The thought and care that went into your plan. The clear and deliberate pathways.

What I would change, why and how:

- Improve communication – open meetings.
- Leave the current system/structure in place.
- It should be connected to each area of the college.
- Not certain I would fully agree with Dean of Technology/Professional Development within the VPAA tier; still see the key tier with some exceptions being with VPAS.
- Keep as is (3 VP’s). Too much responsibility for 2 VP’s.
- Move Advising back to enrollment services. Advising is part of the enrollment process and part of the student success project.

Additional things to investigate and/or consider:

- Leave the current structure in place. What needs to be fixed?
- Issues raised are problems of relationship, not of organization. Work on relationships between people – not organization.

## **Focus on 2014 Page 8**

### Questions:

- What problems are found in our current structure that would make anyone want to change it? What are 8 colleges of MCCC doing that we are not that makes their system successful and ours not?
- In a small campus, with limited funds – I am not certain that moving VP's to a strategic level may not be as practical or ideal. I've had a removed president who functions at the community level and not operational – can we really afford to have 2 more administrators removed from the operation?
- Why are we going to a 2 VP model; we had this before and it did not work. Why would it work now?

### Other:

- If eliminating the Vice President for Student Services position and the separate student services function is such a good idea, why did we not do it earlier?

## **Organizational Structure - Discussion**

### Ideas:

- Need to honor that the missions of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs differ.
- Look at student perspective. Student services and academics need better collaboration and communication. Proposed structure supports this goal.
- This proposed structure mirrors what district is doing with combining the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs under one leader.
- No matter what model, VP's and Dean's need to empower their staff – not micromanage. They should focus on the big picture/vision not the operational details.
- Everyone needs to work together better, communicate, trust and respect one another independent of RFP, part-time, PSA, MAT ranking.
- Not everyone feels heard or that their opinion is respected – specifically non-faculty and MAT.
- IE does not seem connected to the whole college.
- Community Development/Marketing needs to be represented on all pages of the handout – under President and the two VP's.
- Proposed organizational chart seems to indicate that learning does not occur in Administrative Services.

### Suggestions:

- Move Enrollment services out from underneath VP Admin Services.
- Focus on institutionalizing learning.
- Make organizational structure less hierarchical.
- Invert the pyramid so teachers are at the top.
- Need to acknowledge that Student Affairs is distinct.

## **Focus on 2014 Page 9**

- Employee & Organizational Learning should report directly to the President.
- Create 2 versions beginning with areas/departments' functions. Then from there apply positions.

### Questions:

- Does the proposed organizational structure address the challenges of collaboration and communication between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs? Or is there a better way to accomplish this?
- What are the budget implications for the proposed structure? (Staff do not know current budgetary decision-making).
- Who has ownership of learning in the current and proposed organizational chart.
- What are the functions of the Teaching & Learning Center?
- To whom will the Director of Black Mountain report?
- Why are we trying to go back to a previous model (when one of the VP positions was not filled)?
- Why would Advising be a part of Academic Services when it is perceived by some to be part of enrollment services?
- Will the 2 VP's be overworked?
- With this model, will some job functions change in anyway?
- In what time frame will this be implemented?
- Will the 21st Century Maricopa project affect our org. structure?  
Will Marketing begin to do academic support? Someone mentioned that in the past, Marketing (IA) told them that they do not support academic programs, workshops, etc.

### Purpose of Org. Chart:

- Align like functions.
- Clarify and make more efficient the chain of command and responsibilities.
- Support College Mission.