

PROGRAM EVALUATION (PROE)

PURPOSE

Self Study Evaluation

The Community College Evaluation Schedule for Occupational Programs (Section I, Part 5, of the application), and the Community College Summary Report for Self-Study Evaluation of Occupational Programs (Section I, Part 6, of the application) are designed to meet state-level evaluation requirements contained in Section I, Part 3, of the application, Specific Assurances and Planning Descriptions.

It is the intent of these forms to gather information which becomes an integral part of the self-study report. This summary is intended to assist community college staff:

- (1) planning and operating better programs,
- (2) prioritizing grant expenditures,
- (3) improving state-level decision/policy making,
- (4) providing needed informational resources for legislative/administrative action at the federal level, and,
- (5) providing information to the general public on the status and operation of occupational education programs.

The information collected via these forms will be valuable to those:

- (1) involved in operating occupational programs,
- (2) employing occupational graduates,
- (3) serving on various councils/ committees concerning occupational education, and the general public in determining the status and operation of Michigan's occupational programs.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Program evaluation is done on a cyclical basis so that a number of programs are evaluated over a five-year period. Every program should be evaluated or scheduled for the evaluation review with the five-year period for academic years 1995-96 through 1999-2000.

PROGRAM EVALUATION RESOURCES

PURPOSE

The Michigan Community College Occupational Education Evaluation System (MCCOEES) was designed to assist colleges in meeting program evaluation requirements. Program evaluation resources incorporate four major elements: Michigan Student Information System (MiSIS), Program Review in Occupational Education (PROE), Activity Classification Structure (ACS), and Michigan Analysis Network and General Evaluation Report (MANAGER).

COMPONENTS

- A. Michigan Student Information System (Midis) - A series of data collection instruments specifically designed to collect information on student enrollment and follow-up information after completion of training.
- B. Program Review in Occupational Education (PROE) - A consistent, flexible self-study model based on perceptive data from faculty, students, and advisory committee members to be used as a tool in evaluating occupational programs. Validation of the self-study by a team of peers is an essential component of PROE.
 - 1. Program Review Extension Procedures (PREP) - A companion model to PROE for evaluating general education requirements in continuing education and community service, and arts and science or transfer programs.
 - 2. Perceptions of Apprenticeship Classroom Training (PACT) - A set of procedures to review and evaluate course work provided by the college for apprentices in support of their on-the-job training. These procedures help colleges keep their apprentice course work relevant and current with industry practice by systematically eliciting perceptions from key groups or individuals, such as apprentices, employers, instructors, supervisors and Joint Apprenticeship Committee members.
- C. Activity Classification Structure (ACS) - A system designed to aid in the collection of uniform and comparable financial data from Michigan community Colleges.
- D. Michigan Analysis Network and General Evaluation Report (MANAGER) - A system which includes criteria for evaluating occupational education programs from an institutional perspective; a process for summarizing, analyzing, synthesizing, and

interpreting information obtained from the systems of MiSIS, PROE, and ACS and other appropriate sources to be used as a basis for evaluation and establishing guidelines for local decision making.

Note: Should the college choose to use an evaluation method other than PROE, certain criteria must be met. Contact the Community College Services Unit, (517) 373-3360, for approval of the evaluation instrument prior to conducting the evaluation.

BRIEF HISTORY OF P.R.I.M.E.

The initiatives for program review came essentially from two sources: first, OCC has reviewed its occupational programs since 1978 because of vocational education legislation; and secondly, Chancellor Nicholson, who came from Mt. Hood Community College in Oregon where program review was in place across all instructional areas, initiated a task force to develop the extension of OCC program review beyond occupational programs.

July 1986

Dr. Paul Kreider, President of Mt. Hood Community College, came to OCC for a two-day work session on program review process and procedures.

July 1986 - June 1987

The first task force on program review was established. This committee, composed of faculty and administrators, developed a model and reviewed research the college collected on students.

July 1987 - June 1988

The program review effort was reorganized into PRIME (Program Review for Improvement, Management and Excellence). The new structure provided for an executive committee comprised of two faculty plus administrators and management staff, a task force comprised of faculty from each campus, and an expanded task force that included the academic deans.

NCA FOCUSED SELF-STUDY REPORT 1991

PURPOSE

Program Review for Improvement, Management and Excellence (PRIME) is a comprehensive system that monitors, reviews and assesses programs, services and activities. It provides data for planning and feedback to all significant functional units of the College. It provides to faculty, staff and administrators assessments posited on data-based information and cross discipline/services comparisons expressed in consistent, objective evaluative measures.

DESCRIPTION

PRIME is a means of determining what is, which is a necessary step to planning and budgeting, along with the determination of what ought to be. Determining the differences between what is and what ought to be and the means for reducing or eliminating those differences forms the basis of a plan of action. Program Review is not evaluation of persons, nor is it necessarily an instrument to justify the elimination of programs

PRIME operates on an annual cycle of data generation, data review, and planning. Based on a set of worksheets generated by the College computer system for each budgetary cost center, the review process provides an examination of the data by faculty, staff, and administration in their respective cost centers; input of self-reported information by those directly involved; and face-to-face discussions regarding implications, goals, and directions.

PRIME consists of three separate but related procedures for instruction, Student Services, and Administration. Worksheets are developed for specific attributes or areas of performance to be assessed, such as cost effectiveness, institutional support, and meeting student goals. Some of these "key indicators" of organizational effectiveness can be applied equally to Instruction, Student Services, and Administration. Others are applicable to only one or two of the major College functions.

The program review process begins with the printing of worksheets for each budgetary cost center by the College computer center. The worksheets, with a glossary of terms and letters of explanation, are distributed to departments through their administrative networks. (See Appendix 3 for glossary and instructions.)

Faculty and staff are asked to examine the computer-generated data, fill in additional data where available, and write in other information as it pertains to their activity. The completed worksheet is reviewed with the appropriate administrator and two additional forms are completed jointly. The Content Review Form provides for recommendations and concerns regarding the content of the worksheets and the implications for planning. The second form, the Process Review Form,

provides a means of input regarding the PRIME process itself, with opportunity to make recommendations for change and improvement. Copies of these forms are included as Appendix 4.

Following the review process by faculty, staff and administration, the worksheets are retained for use in the budget planning process and as information to be fed into the strategic planning review. One copy of the worksheets and the Content Review Form are sent to the Office of Institutional Research. The Process Review Form is returned to the PRIME Coordinating Committee for its use in evaluating and revising the procedures.

DEVELOPMENT

Background

Development of program review began in 1986 with a request by Chancellor R. S. Nicholson that the curriculum review of occupational programs mandated by the State of Michigan be expanded to include all college functions. Further impetus for the effort was given by the North Central Association report on the 1987 visit which identified a concern for program evaluation and curriculum leadership. In 1987-88 an executive committee composed of two faculty, three administrators and two computer systems staff was established, and the official name of the project was set. It was the intent from the beginning that PRIME was to be developed largely by the people who would be utilizing the methodology to review their own activities within the College.

Instruction

The first phase of PRIME to be developed was that for Instruction. The PRIME Instructional Task Force of fourteen faculty and nine administrators researched, met with consultants, and examined materials from other colleges to gain background information and to make decisions about content and format. Since the model developed for Instruction was to be applied also to Student Services and Administration, a major effort with appropriate resources was put into place. During the year and one-half that the task force worked, it met twice per month (with the College instructional deans attending once each month) and spent about \$25,000. Appendix 5 contains a progress report to the Board of Trustees on the development of PRIME for Instruction. As the project progressed, monthly reports were made to the College Academic Senate and periodically to the campus senates. Instructional PRIME was pilot tested in the fall of 1988 in nine program/discipline areas, and the first full run for all instructional areas took place in the fall of 1989.

Student Services and Administration

Task forces were then established to develop the worksheets for Student Services and for the Administration components of PRIME. As there had been one counselor on the Instruction Task Force who was also named to the Student Services Task Force, a teaching faculty member also made this transition. These two individuals were later named to the Administration Task Force as well. The development work in these task forces was greatly aided by the two carryover members.

It was intended that the indicators (i.e. qualities to be evaluated) and format of PRIME for Instruction would also be used in the other two areas. As work began on the Student Services worksheets, however, it became obvious that changes would be necessary. Student Services was more varied in its applications than Instruction. A decision was made to retain the six major indicators, but to allow the format to be developed as needed. The result greatly resembled that of Instruction, but provided the flexibility necessary to accommodate the range of Student Services functions. The pilot test of eight Student Services cost centers representing activities on each of the campuses and at the central office was conducted in the spring of 1990.

Later in the development of the Administration instruments, both the indicators and the format were again modified. For Administration PRIME it was decided to begin the pilot test for all areas, which amounted to a full run, in the summer of 1990. The final result is a set of materials that provides for the review of all areas, yet retains sufficient consistency to accomplish its purpose.

CURRENT STATUS

The results of the first full review of Instruction in the fall of 1989 were generally favorable. Faculty and administrators found value in the information generated and in the increased communication that the review process provided. Some data errors were identified and corrected for subsequent runs. A procedure was put in place for entering self-reported data so that it would appear on the computer-generated printouts the following year. The Office of Institutional Research prepared a preliminary report based on the information gathered from the Content Review Forms according to recommendations and concerns noted by faculty and deans. The Coordinating Committee examined the Process Review Forms to identify needed changes in procedures.

By the fall of 1990, the second full review of Instruction was underway, as was the first full run for Student Services. The Administration pilot was nearing completion. A full set of completed worksheets and review materials is expected to be on file by the end of January 1991.

FUTURE APPLICATIONS

Upon completion of the review process the task forces for Administration and for Student Services will discuss the process and make recommendations for adjustments and changes. The integration of PRIME with the College strategic plan will be made more explicit, and a single calendar/time line for PRIME, Strategic Planning, and Budgeting will be adopted.

The current means of reporting to the State of Michigan on career programs is a state developed process called PROE, Program Review for Occupational Education. This system has been used for a number of years and has been determined to be in need of revision, or perhaps replacement, by the State. PRIME materials have been shared with State officials, who have expressed considerable interest. As a beginning, Oakland Community College plans to use PRIME as its reporting process to the State for career programs.

While some benefits of PRIME are already evident, the real strengths and contributions it will make will be seen after two to three years of use. The multi-year patterns of data reporting will become more meaningful, and the practical applications will be seen as the results are applied to planning and budgeting over several years. Increased levels and quality of communication between supervisors and staff have already been seen and should continue as the common language and terms PRIME provides are more fully understood and applied.

As an institution we are pleased with the development of program review to date. PRIME has provided a common framework for all employees of the College to assess and discuss our current status. It also causes each employee to answer the question, "What do I do that helps the student meet his or her goals?" On that foundation, institutional goal setting and resource allocation can be structured.

**PROGRAM REVIEW
FOR
IMPROVEMENT, MANAGEMENT AND EXCELLENCE**

P.R.I.M.E.

MISSION

Given the college's mission "...quality learning opportunities and other services," the administration and faculty must monitor, review and assess key indicators to support that mission. The vehicle for such analysis is PRIME (Program Review for Improvement, Management and Excellence), a process which provides to faculty and administrators assessments posited on data-based information and cross-discipline/service comparisons expressed in consistent, objective, evaluative measures.

GOALS

1. Establish P.R.I.M.E. Task Force.
2. Develop comprehensive dissemination activities to ensure awareness/acceptance of P.R.I.M.E.
3. Develop short and long range plans, and implement operating strategies.
4. Develop components of P.R.I.M.E. process.
5. Implement pilot P.R.I.M.E. project.
6. Implement P.R.I.M.E. on a college-wide basis.

PROGRAM REVIEW FOR IMPROVEMENT, MANAGEMENT AND EXCELLENCE

P.R.I.M.E.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

- * P.R.I.M.E. AS A COMMON GOAL (THE IMPROVEMENT OF COURSES/PROGRAMS/SERVICES) OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY IS A BASIC ASSUMPTION FROM WHICH WE OPERATE.
- * THE PROCESS IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE PRODUCT; THE MOST DESIRED INSIGHTS AND OUTCOMES HAPPEN DURING THE PROCESS.
- * THE ADMINISTRATION MUST ASSURE THE FACULTY THAT NO HARM WILL COME TO THEM BECAUSE OF THIS PROCESS.
- * TO BE SUCCESSFUL, FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION NEED TO HAVE OWNERSHIP IN P.R.I.M.E.
- * AT THE VERY OUTSET, ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP OF P.R.I.M.E. SHOULD BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED.
- * P.R.I.M.E. NEEDS ADMINISTRATIVE INVOLVEMENT AT A LEVEL HIGH ENOUGH TO BE ABLE TO SET IN MOTION DECISIONS MADE AND TO GATHER RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT THOSE DECISIONS.
- * COLLEGE COMMITMENT TO P.R.I.M.E. MUST BE LONG TERM.
- * WHILE A TIMELINE IS HELPFUL IN PROVIDING A GENERAL FRAMEWORK, FLEXIBILITY IS ESSENTIAL.
- * THE FIRST IMPLEMENTATION OF THE P.R.I.M.E. CYCLE IS VALUABLE; HOWEVER, USEFULNESS INCREASES AS EACH SUCCESSIVE CYCLE OCCURS AND DATA CAN BE COMPARED.
- * P.R.I.M.E. IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CYCLE THAT ALSO INCLUDES STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING.
- * THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT PLUS RESEARCH DATA ARE LINKED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE SURVEY CANNOT BE COMPLETED WITHOUT THIS DATA.
- * THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS ALLOWS THE COURSE/PROGRAM/ SERVICE NOT ONLY TO SEE "ITSELF" BUT ALSO TO SEE "OTHERS" IN RELATION TO ITSELF, BOTH FROM A DISTRICT AND A CAMPUS PERSPECTIVE.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AT OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The development of a five-year strategic plan for Oakland Community College began in the Fall of 1988, when Chancellor R. Stephen Nicholson and Highland Lakes President Richard Saunders outlined the planning goals and process for the OCC Board of Trustees.

The process was designed to produce two major components: Academic Master Plan and Administrative Master Plan. Each of these would be developed around assumptions about future demographic, economic, social, and political conditions at the local and state levels as they might affect the college five years hence. In addition, reference was made to the AACJC position paper, Building Communities, and to the MacConnell study commissioned by the College in 1986.

Work on the Academic Master Plan began in early 1989 with the formulation of a Strategic Planning Steering Committee, an Academic Master Planning Steering Committee and seven different planning teams, each with a specific issue to address. These teams were composed of faculty, staff, administrators, and in some cases, students. Over a period of four months, the teams reviewed pertinent research materials, developed assumption, revealed findings and, ultimately, produced a series of categorical recommendations fashioned as objectives.

Each of the teams' reports were distributed throughout the College for reaction prior to finalization. Written responses were returned to the teams for further consideration. In some cases, teams reviewed and modified their objectives as a result of receiving these responses. Later, members of the Chancellor's Leadership Team revised the AMP objectives and made additional modifications as deemed appropriate. Created and directed in this manner, these objectives then became the foundation of the Academic Master Plan for the period 1990-1995.

Work on the Administrative Master Plan has already begun and is to be completed by November, 1989. The process will be identical to that used to develop the Academic Master Plan with a series of objectives as the expected outcome.

The schedule calls for the presentation of the entire plan, both the Academic and Administrative Master Plans, to the Chancellor in December 1989. Subsequently, and in concert with the development of the College budget, strategies will be proposed annually by various college units in support of the objectives produced by the planning teams. The objectives, strategies and budget are to be complementary in every way.

At the end of each academic year, the results of current strategic initiatives will be evaluated, planning assumptions and objectives will be reviewed, and new strategies will be formulated accordingly. The entire plan will then be extended another year resulting in a renewed five-year strategic plan.

The strategic planning process adopted by Oakland Community College is generally accepted as the classic industry model and has proven to be effective in a variety of settings both public and private.

BACKGROUND

Throughout the following year,(?) Employees at all levels were familiarized with the essence of Strategic Planning and with the process to be used at OCC.

The process selected was a classic model that began with the College's Mission Statement from which goals were derived. Each goal became a target whose attainment was dependent upon a series of outcomes (objectives). These objectives were to be achieved via actions (strategies) employed at all levels of College operations. Finally, milestones were established and measured annually to ascertain the degree to which the College was successful in achieving its goals.

Initially it was decided that the Strategic Plan would cover a period of five years (1989-1994). It would be a "rolling five-year plan" and, consequently, would extend a year, annually, thereafter. However, as the Strategic Planning process matured, OCC has moved to a two-year planning cycle.

Planning began in earnest in October, 1989, with the formation of fourteen planning teams representing a cross-section of College personnel. Seven of these teams dealt with issues of an academic nature and were asked to produce an Academic Master Plan. The other seven teams were asked to produce an Administrative Master Plan. Both of these plans were completed in December, 1989, and were approved by the Board of Trustees in January, 1990. *(Later, the number of planning teams was reduced from fourteen to eight. And, ultimately, (currently) these gave way to a series of open planning sessions involving over a hundred people from across the College.)*

The evolution of Strategic Planning at OCC has resulted in a more streamlined and organized process that relies heavily upon information. The end product of College-wide planning sessions is the establishment of College Strategic Directions which are to be attained over the following two years (1992-94). Each campus and central office function then develops Strategies in support of College Strategic Directions. Finally, all units of the College establish specific objectives to attain their campus/area strategies. The College's annual operating budget is then built around the objectives for that academic year.

Although the planning process is somewhat complex and lengthy, it produces good results. First, the College has reconsidered its direction and priorities, and has begun to focus its resources accordingly. Second, literally hundreds of employees at all levels have begun to dialogue about the major issues facing the institution in the years to come and about their visions of OCC's destiny. Finally, we have begun to consider how we will measure our success as an educational institution and what we mean by the term "excellence."

In the time that has passed since the first iteration of Strategic Planning at OCC, several elements have been added to increase the level of sophistication and confidence in the process.

We have now recognized that several external “key drivers” can and do heavily impact our ability to succeed as an institution. These key drivers are: Educational Trends, Occupational Trends, Funding, Enrollment Patterns, Legislation/Regulation, Economics, and External Opinion. Thus, each of these issues are carefully monitored for trends and relationships throughout the year, and assumptions are generated accordingly for planning purposes. This process, known widely as “Environmental Scanning,” helps to reveal the opportunities and threats which may face us in the near future. Armed with this information, we can more intelligently establish our annual objectives.

In addition to determining our key drivers, we set about identifying those areas in which we most need to succeed as a community college. We call these our “Critical Success Factors.” They are: Student Outcomes, Resource Viability, Community Integration, Renewal of Resources, and Continual Monitoring.

To help us devise systems for measuring our success in these five areas, we engaged British Columbia Research Corporation, Vancouver, B.C. Canada. With the help of researcher John Cousineau, we established 153 indicators of institutional outcomes related to our “Critical Success Factors.” (*While the data systems of all 153 indicators will not be operational until 1994, currently data have been produced and are being utilized for the 1992-94 Strategic Plan in at least twelve areas.*)

In developing OCC’s information reporting system we identified six elements which required attention in order for the system to be effective. These elements included:

- Conceptually* developing a data/information reporting system
- Technically* developing the capability
- Humanly* involving the appropriate people
- Analyzing* information effectively
- Disseminating* information in a timely and useful manner
- Relating* information to decision making

Our latest enhancement of the Strategic Planning process is in the establishment of a “Vision/Values” statement which was prompted by our new Chancellor, Dr. Patsy Fulton, upon her arrival at OCC in March, 1991.

DEVELOPMENT

In November of 1988, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees directed the College to formulate a strategic plan for implementation in the years 1990-1995. The intent was to ensure that OCC moves forward by identifying and achieving goals and objectives based on quality, productivity,

relevance, and growth.

Throughout 1989 over 100 faculty, staff, administrators, and students worked on fourteen planning teams to develop two distinct, but complementary plans: the Academic Master Plan and the Administrative Master Plan. Each of these plans listed goals and objectives deemed necessary for the College to continue its high level of effectiveness into the next decade.

In early 1990 these plans were submitted to the Chancellor's Council whose responsibility it was to clarify and establish priorities for the recommended goals and objectives, and to develop institutional policies required to achieve them. The Council then determined the sequence for accomplishment of objectives and allocated them to each of the five years (1990-1995). These were submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval and then published college-wide so that individual strategies could be developed and implemented at each of the College's sites.

In the fall of 1990 the planning cycle was renewed. The planning teams (now consolidated from fourteen to eight teams) were reassembled to review the previous objectives and to make changes as appropriate for future years.

DESCRIPTION

The Oakland Community College strategic planning model has four distinct phases:

Phase 1 - Environmental Scanning: Identifies and monitors issues and trends in seven "key driver" areas that have significant impact on the College.

- Enrollment
- External Opinion
- Occupational Trends
- Educational Trends
- Politics/Legislation/Regulation
- Economy
- Funding

From data gathered in these areas and in conjunction with specific internal information, planning assumptions are developed with regard to their probable effects on the College over the next five years. These planning assumptions are provided to each of the Academic and Administrative Master Planning Teams.

Phase II - Strategic Planning: Eight Master Planning Teams meet annually to review, modify as necessary, and develop institutional objectives (outcomes) for the next five years. These teams, which include administrators, faculty, and management staff, are organized around the following topics:

- Rate and Type of Growth - Role and Market
- Programs and Services
- Resources Academic Standards/Professional Standards
- Accounting-Budgeting-Purchasing
- Public Safety-Physical Facilities
- Information Telecommunication Systems
- Human Resources

The first four topics are assigned to four Academic Master Planning Teams, one team for each topic; the last four topics are covered by four Administrative Master Planning Teams.

Phase III - Planning and Budgeting: Committees on each campus and in Central Office develop strategies and budgets to carry out the planning objectives established for the following year.

Phase IV - Evaluation: Instruments such as Program Review for Improvement, Management and Excellence (PRIME) and Program Review in Occupational Education (PROE), are used to determine the effectiveness of adopted strategies. In addition, "Critical Success Factors" are measured and the results reported throughout the College in order to determine the degree to which the strategic plan is producing the desired results.

INFORMATION BASED PLANNING: THE ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING

1992 ANNUAL NCA MEETING - CHICAGO

INTRODUCTION

Environmental scanning is a process of systematically reviewing a diversity of information sources to keep apprised of issues and trends that may affect the future of higher education. At Oakland Community College (OCC), environmental scanning is being used as a way to conduct informed planning as well as being used as a tool for attitudinal change. Summaries which are written from the scanning process provide college staff with information needed to understand what issues and trends are affecting the future of community college education. As a result, both faculty and staff have developed a more proactive orientation.

There are multiple uses for the results of environmental scanning, including strategic planning and budgeting, discipline planning, marketing, accreditation, fund raising and friend raising, proposal writing, lobbying and public relations (Clagett 1988-89). The focus of this presentation is on the use of environmental scanning process, it is worthwhile to first explain the strategic planning context.

THE STRATEGIC PLANNING CONTEXT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING

As a public institution accountable to and serving the tax payers of the county, OCC must operate with clear direction and focus and with a sense of the degree to which it is accomplishing its mission and goals. To achieve its objectives, OCC has developed and is using the process of strategic planning. The strategic plan forces the college to make assumptions about the future, determine what institutional outcomes will be necessary in the future, take actions that will ensure those outcomes, and then to measure the college's overall success.

Impact Vol. No. 1

The Scanning Process

Scanning was originally started at OCC in 1991 to support and validate strategic planning. While the process initially involved more than 70 faculty and staff, the committee structure has recently been streamlined to address concerns about its complexity and the time demands placed on members. Currently a core scanning group of twelve faculty and staff meet regularly to actively support the scanning process. On an on-going basis over eighty publications and other sources of information are regularly scanned and abstracted to identify trends and implications for this newsletter. We encourage all member of the OCC community to read and respond to its content.

Environmental scanning is the process of systematically reviewing diverse information sources to determine the impact of external forces on the institution and their implications for the future of the College. Environmental scanning at OCC is directly linked to the development and implementation of the College's biennial strategic plan. Its scope encompasses all aspects of the College's work, serving the academic, administrative, financial and external relations areas.

Oakland Community College
ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING MODEL

SCANNING PROCESS

Continuously	Scan, distribute, read, and abstract material
September	Membership building
October	Initial committee meetings
February	Distribution and review of abstracts among committee members
March/April	Committee discussion of abstracts and editing of summary reports
Early May	Summary reports due to Institutional Planning & Analysis
Late May	College wide discussion of implications/development of Executive Summary
June	Distribution of final Report

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

Identification of Critical Success Factors

In the fall of 1990 an Outcomes Task Force comprised of faculty, management and administrative staff was organized and charged with the responsibility of developing appropriate measures of the College's effectiveness. The task force was charged with answering the question:

“What do we expect of our students when they ‘finish’ their courses of study, and how do we determine if those expectations are met?”

In order to address this question, the task force identified three areas which needed to be investigated:

1. Thoroughly examine external expectations from state and federal governments as well as accrediting agencies in terms of Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment.
2. Investigate Institutional Effectiveness models and Outcomes Assessment activities at other institutions of higher education across the country.
3. Conduct an extensive inventory of all data and information currently existing within the College.

As work progressed a consultant from British Columbia Research Corporation in Canada was retained to assist the college in identifying and measuring those indicators that are “critical” to the success of the College. After several months of work a total of one hundred and forty (140) indicators in twenty-seven (27) indices within five (5) Critical Success Factors were established. These factors are as follows:

1. Student Outcomes:
 - Student satisfaction index
 - Graduate satisfaction index
 - Student feedback index
 - Student demand index
 - First impressions index
 - Course evaluation index
 - Overall student satisfaction index
 - Transfer index
 - Transfer probability index
 - Graduate placement index
 - Placement probability index
 - General education skills development index
 - Skills gain index
 - Student goal clarification and attainment index

2. Resource Viability:
 - Affordability for students index
 - Gross unit operating cost index
 - Cost flexibility index
 - Space entitlement index
 - Plan implementation index

3. Community Integration:
 - Student involvement in learning index
 - OCC's reputation in the community index
 - Match between OCC and its community index
 - OCC's presents in the community index
 - Employer satisfaction index

4. Continuous Renewal:
 - Employees renewal and improvement index
 - Curricula renewal index
 - Equipment investment index

5. Continual Monitoring

Involvement of all segments of OCC staff resulted in widespread acceptance of these Critical Success Factors and the indices that comprise them.

NCA IV

CURRENT AND FUTURE PLANNING

DRAFT SECTION FOR QUESTIONS 4,5,6 OF THE OUTLINE

Oakland Community College under Chancellor Patsy Calkins prepared Strategic Directions and Operational Plan for the years 1994-96 (Appendix reference). All sites established operational plans under those Directions. However, during the fall of the 1995-96 school year the Board of Trustees relieved Chancellor Calkins of her responsibilities. As a result, the second year under the College Strategic Directions was interrupted by the events leading to her dismissal, the departure of two vice-chancellors, and the short tenures of interim chancellors. The Strategic Directions were "forgotten" amid the de-stabilization and re-stabilization period; nevertheless, strategic objectives and operational strategies at the College's various sites continued.

With the appoint of a new chancellor, Richard Thompson, in early 1996, the College began a re-stabilization period. This re-stabilization did not include formal status reporting for the two-year planning period which was coming to close in 1996, nor for a comprehensive assessment or measurement of the Operational Plan under the Strategic Directions. No summary assessment of the Strategic Directions/Operational Plan process, nor formal termination of same, occurred during this re-stabilization period.

In May of 1996 Chancellor Thompson communicated by memorandum with all college employees that the 1996-97 year would be a transition year between planning processes (Appendix reference). In his memorandum he forecast that the re-drafted College Mission and Purposes would be ratified by the College community and the Board of Trustees and that this affirmation would precede and lead planning for a new planning period 1997-99. He also forecast the re-shaping and re-organizing of the College and the various operational College councils. Finally, he identified eight short-term objectives, "in lieu of strategic directions," for the 1996-97 academic year.

In July, 1996, the Chancellor's Council approved the reformation of Councils and the creation of a Presidents' Cabinet. The new format of councils included the Chancellor's Council, College Planning Council, College Administrative Services Council, College Academic and Student Services Council, and Presidents' Cabinet. Councils, with the exception of the Presidents' Cabinet, were reformed to expand the bases of representation among the College community. Mr. Thompson re-defined the focus and purposes of each council; however, the councils' purposes were seen to be evolving rather than definitive. The charge of "planning to plan" fell to the College Planning Council (Appendix reference). The College Planning Council (CPC) held its inaugural meeting in September, 1996, and has met monthly since then (to-date 2/97) to establish the plan for the planning process.

The College planning design as devised by the CPC for the present and future can be described as follows. The College will be guided first and foremost in its planning by its mission and

purposes. The purposes will be clearly defined by broad-based college community consensus, and effectiveness measures by the same means will be identified for each purpose. Institutional Research will be the reporting agency on effectiveness measures.

The overall intention of the new planning process is to place planning well in front of budgeting processes. To that end, effectiveness measures will be reported out annually in late spring; the first report will be spring, 1997. Benchmarks will be established over time against which we can measure relative effectiveness among our purposes. The continual development and refinement of both measurements, assessments, and benchmarks will be an on-going leadership responsibility of the CPC.

Concurrent with the reporting cycle for these purposes/institutional effectiveness measures, strategic plans for fiscal development, facilities, technology, human resources, academic and student initiatives (academic master plan), will be articulated. The CPC will be the receiving agency in late spring for the onset of a two-year planning cycle. The CPC in that initial summer will establish the College Strategic priorities; these will include initiatives to impact institutional effectiveness for the College Mission and Purposes as well as priorities synthesized from the strategic plans identified above.

The consequence of the setting of these priorities is the development during the first year of the cycle, fall, of implementation assessment, feasibility analysis, resource inventories, and projections so that budget resources will be allocated in the annual operational budget cycle (typically finalized in the January-June period). In the fall, concurrent with these assessment processes, under the leadership of the CPC, site-based operational planning and budgeting will ensue, enlightened by the priorities and set-asides established by the CPC in Spring/Summer. Budgeting for strategic and operational plans will occur in the January - June part of the cycle. While the priorities theoretically could be initiated as soon as they are declared in the original year of the two-year pattern, the reality is that resource allocation, if required, would only occur in January - June, such that implementation of priorities becomes a second-year event in the two-year pattern. Conceptually, then, planning is one year in advance of implementation, with preparation and budgeting taking place in the interval.

The CPC then has major quarterly responsibilities: 1) to set priorities (spring/summer); 2) to establish assessment of needs of priorities' implementation (fall); 3) to ensure resource allocation for priorities (winter); 4) to receive strategic plans, synthesize and analyze plans and effectiveness measures (spring/summer). Outcomes measures for strategic priorities become operative at the end of a two-year cycle, although assessment will be on-going during the cycle and annual adjustments will be factored in.

STRENGTHS OF THE PLANNING MODEL

1. CPC's membership is a broad-base of college employees.
2. Planning occurs before budgeting (plan-driven)

3. The planning function is synchronous rather than hierarchical. The CPC serves as clearing-house for, management unit of, the planning process and cycles.
4. Planning is on-going and interlocked year to year.
5. The planning model ownership is vested in the CPC rather than in a single individual (such as a Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor).
6. Assessment, outcomes, and benchmarks are systemized, routinized essentials of the planning processes.

WEAKNESSES OF THE PLANNING MODEL

1. It is not yet fully operationalized.
2. Planning and outcomes assessment and effectiveness measurement have not been institutionalized, fixed in the culture of the College' hence, the proclivity of a planning model to yield to inertia and accountability failure.
3. Adaptability and flexibility of the model not tested.
4. Resiliency of the model not tested.
5. Unclear at this point what assessment and outcomes measures will be systemized for the priorities and various strategic plans.