

WCC Planning Council Retreat Evaluation Analysis

Wayne Community College conducted their annual Planning Council Retreat on March 26, 2003. The following is the results from an evaluation that the Planning Council Members completed in evaluating the Planning Council Retreat. Twenty-eight evaluations were sent out to participating Planning Council Members. Twenty-two evaluations were returned. The below analysis was compiled from the results tabulated.

1. What preparations did you do prior to the retreat in regards to the prioritization of planning objectives? (None, Perused the objectives, Studied the objectives, or Studied the objectives and asked questions of appropriate departments – additional comments requested)

All of the respondents either studied the objectives (14) or studied them and asked questions of the appropriate department (9). Most of the comments came from the nine who did the most preparation. Typical comments included: evaluation based on creating some kind of a rating scale, contacting departments heads was limited by time and their unavailability, and that the pre-planning meeting was a plus.

2. In your opinion, should the funded and non-funded objectives be combined on the same prioritization list? (Yes, No – requested explanation)

On the issue of combining those objectives requiring funding with those objectives that can be accomplished with departmental resources (no new funding) on the same prioritization list, the vote was split with nine “yes”, twelve “no” and one “unsure”. The “yes” voters emphasized the overall needs of the college, the big picture. The “no” voters appeared confused on the difference between what a funded and non-funded objective really is. Complicating the issue is the state budgetary funding problems and its impact on the college’s budget.

3. What are the criteria that you used to prioritize your 18 votes? (written explanation requested)

By far the most common response to the criteria used to prioritize their 18 votes was WCC’s Strategic Area of Emphasis List and references to the college’s objectives and needs of the college (21). There were four references to impact on the students and one each to faculty and staff, community needs and the individuals past experience. Interestingly, there were only two acknowledgements that the Vice-President’s or Division Head’s had any effect on prioritizing their votes.

4. Did the Vice-President’s/Associate Vice-President’s/Division Heads presentations influence your selections? (Yes, No - requested explanation)

When asked if the Vice-Presidents’ or Division Heads influenced their vote, seventeen said “yes”, five said “no”, and two didn’t vote. The voters are responding here to the influence within the department. If they were already going to cast a vote within an area, some were influenced by what the Vice-President’s or Division Head’s articulated as their most important objective.

5. Were there any presenters that persuaded you to change your selections or influenced you to choose one of their objectives over another? (Yes, No - requested explanation)

Ten voters were persuaded to change their selections based on what they heard from the presenters. Again, however, it appears they only changed what they were already going to vote for within that area.

6. If yes to #5, what was it about their presentations that had an effect on your choices? (written explanation requested)

The main reason voters changed their vote at the retreat was because of a clarification or the sense of urgency demonstrated by the presenter.

7. In your opinion, would a more in depth explanation of the voting process help you in making your selections? (Yes, No, Maybe - requested explanation)

The overwhelming majority of respondents felt that a more in-depth explanation of the voting process was unnecessary.

8. What suggestions do you have that would have helped you with a better understanding of the process? (written explanation requested)

There were not many suggestions on how to improve the process. Three suggestions included: categorize the objectives, have a “mock” one to two hour training retreat, and that all members should attend all meetings.

9. Agenda and time was well planned? (Yes, No)

All the respondents that responded felt that the agenda and time was well spent.

10. Length of the retreat was: (too long, too short, just right)

Nineteen felt the length of the retreat was just right.

11. Presentations and updates were appropriate and valuable. (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

This question was asked in regards to the afternoon presentations/updates given on the SACS update, Performance Measures and Standards, Economic Impact Report, Futures Conference discussion, and the Grant power point presentation. The wording of the question seemed to ask the same that was asked in question number 4. The results however, indicated that 7 “strongly agreed”, 12 “agreed”, and 4 did not respond to the question.

12. What was your overall rating of the Planning Council Retreat? (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor)

The ratings for the overall Planning Council Retreat were excellent to very good with four commenting that this was the best in years. Only two comments were mentioned more than once: keep it short and the Vice-President’s and Division Head’s need to be better prepared and clearer.