



OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE®

## **Integrated Planning**

June 17, 2013

**Prepared by:**



College Brain Trust

**Julie Slark  
Mike Brandy  
Ed Buckley  
Diane Troyer**

**Consultants**

**Dr. George R. Boggs  
Team Leader**

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

CBT's goal was to facilitate development of a continuous assessment, planning, and improvement structure for OCC by June 30, 2013. OCC leadership was able to establish some foundations for a continuous assessment and planning model, and the hope is that by the end of 2013-14, a model will be in place. During 2012-13, however, some OCC planning activities that were to become critical planning and assessment cycle components were still in the development stages, such as program review and the educational master plan (EMP).

CBT provided continuous consultation, suggested models of examples of best practices, and provided recommendations regarding EMP, program review, and a culture of evidence. Many of those recommendations supported the development and future implementation of an integrated planning model. This report identifies the "next steps" agreed upon with OCC planning leadership for development of a systematic planning cycle, and the CBT consultant team has made additional recommendations for good practices for planning. Ultimately, the goal is for OCC to coordinate the EMP, a new strategic plan or strategic vision, department plans, KPIs, program review, a technology plan, resource allocation processes, and other selected research and evaluation findings, along with organizational structures, within a culture of evidence, into a cohesive process that enhances student success and institutional effectiveness.

#### TASK OVERVIEW:

This task includes assisting OCC to "align the College Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, Program Review, the budget allocation model, and other institutional plans into an integrated planning model that promotes institutional effectiveness". The task's completion date was set for June 30, 2013. The CBT consultant team for this task included Julie Slark, Mike Brandy, Diane Troyer, and Ed Buckley. Because of their other CBT responsibilities and activities at OCC, consultants Ed Buckley and Diane Troyer were well prepared to lead the efforts to facilitate connections between the EMP, the strategic plan, KPIs and program review. Diane Troyer provided additional expertise relative to ensuring integration of data, a culture of evidence, and assessment in planning. And, Mike Brandy consulted regarding coordinating planning with resource allocation processes.

An ideal assessment structure includes cyclic steps of assessment, planning, implementation, and improvement at the college and department levels, as well as integration of plans *between* the college and departments levels. In addition to systematic steps to implement such a model, however, an organization needs a *culture of inquiry and evidence* that pervades practice and decision-making in order for institutional

effectiveness to become a reality. A fully developed integrated planning structure is further described in the attached, “Components and Features of Integrated Planning”, CBT – October 2012.

During 2012-13, the CBT consultant team:

1. collaborated continuously with other CBT team members to design and coordinate activities,
2. reviewed appropriate college documents and progress reports,
3. led multiple telephone conferences with OCC leadership and the OCC Executive Director of Institutional Research, Quality & Planning (IRQP), Nancy Showers, conducted two site visits focused on integrated planning, to meet with key leadership groups and individuals, one October 16, 2013, and one on May 8, 2013,
4. developed a guiding document that articulates the components and features of integrated planning,
5. provided recommendations and models of integrated planning structures,
6. facilitated activities that contribute to an effective integrated planning structure, including program review, closure to the development of the EMP, creation of a culture of evidence, and specific organizational structures and processes, and
7. supported the development of “next steps” for the development and implementation of an aligned planning model.

During 2012-13, the CBT consultant team worked primarily with, first, the Academic Leadership Team (ALT), because this group was leading the development of the EMP and program review efforts, and then with the Executive Director of IRQ&P during her changing and developing college-wide planning role.

CBT has worked to support the development of individual components of a planning structure, as well as an awareness of the need for integrated planning, in preparation for OCC’s further work.

#### FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS:

CBT consultants found that OCC is in the very initial stages of developing leadership, core components, and structures for stakeholder participation for planning. During 2012-13, OCC completed an Educational Master Plan (EMP), which is centrally focused on student success, and redesigned its program review and curriculum assessment model. The alignment and coordination of all college plans, resource allocation processes, and evaluation activities, that is, an integrated assessment, planning, implementation, and improvement cycle, is still a long-term goal for OCC, with many of the key steps, connections and practices yet to be put in place.

In late October 2012, OCC was bringing closure to the development of the EMP by identifying measurable objectives for goals, as well as evidence to inform goals. OCC is now assigning responsibilities and timelines for implementation of the EMP objectives. A process for stakeholder engagement for planning and ongoing broad-based planning oversight is not yet clear since the College Planning Council has been temporarily

suspended. The “ALT+10” group, however, a proposed group as of Spring 2013, could be a beginning step for inclusiveness in planning implementation. Further, the program review process (known at OCC as the “Curriculum/Student Learning Review”, coupled with “Academic Performance Review”) is completing a pilot implementation and seeking appropriate approvals, and revisions to that process have been recommended by CBT.

There is currently no alignment between resource allocation processes and planning, and there are no topical plans, such as for technology and human resources, available. However, there are initial efforts to begin development of technology plans that would be coordinated with the new college planning organizations and structures.

Also, OCC’s Office of Institutional Research (IR) was newly charged with the responsibility for college planning. This was a positive organizational change that should result in the critical integration between planning and data-informed decision-making. However, the Executive Director of IRQ&P needed more time to facilitate the completion of the EMP before focusing on planning alignment. Additionally, in Spring 2013, the Executive Director of IRQ&P was assigned to report directly to the college chancellor in regard to planning responsibilities.

In support of an effective and systemic organizational structure and procedures for planning, CBT consultants Diane Troyer and Eleanor Brown met with Nancy Showers, Executive Director of IRQ&P, in May 2013, to facilitate her work in enhancing a culture of evidence. Such a culture of evidence would include the application of data toward strategic decision-making. Nancy Showers is in the process of shifting her priorities, organizational structure, and role in light of her expanded responsibility in planning. She has taken several steps that are important and necessary for her new role and responsibilities. First, she is in the process of restructuring her department's organizational structure to allow her to focus on planning as well as institutional research functions. This includes reducing the number of “direct reports”, assigning responsibility for some components of institutional research to capable staff, and arranging support for her role in college-wide planning.

Second, she has been assigned the task of preparing the college for application for the Baldrige award. She recognizes the need for processes and systems that reflect integrated planning, including assessment practices that result in improvement and accountability. She is aligning her work in bringing forward a framework for planning consistent with the Baldrige criteria.

Third, she has clarified her organizational placement vis-a-vis college-wide planning and has established regular meetings and communication with the Chancellor for this function. Lastly, she is initiating a process to clarify the college vision for student success that will inform all planning. All of these actions relate and connect back to both fostering a culture of evidence as well as efforts to create an integrated planning system.

## ANALYSIS:

Because the ALT was completing the EMP and the design of program review during the fall of 2012, CBT's goal for this task became to work with OCC leadership to facilitate development of the foundations for integrated planning in early 2013. In the mean time, CBT provided reports for contracted tasks that included recommendations relative to the EMP, program review, and data capacity and culture of evidence, and several of the recommendations were designed to ensure alignment of all planning components. Specifically, for program review (CBT contract task #9, which ended January 1, 2013), CBT recommended that:

- The Academic Performance Review (APR) should continue to provide the disciplines with the basic data and evidence to support their 5-year reviews, but not as a separate component. Rather APR should become an integrated part of Discipline Program Review.
- Discipline Program Review should require all disciplines to develop goals to align with the college's mission and with the EMP objectives and next steps. (#6)
- The college needs to develop a resource allocation system that requires disciplines to demonstrate that their resource requests align with their stated goals and action steps, and that the calendars for resource requests are in sync with the college calendars for resource decision-making.

For the EMP (CBT contract task that concluded January 1, 2013), CBT made two recommendations:

- Develop procedures and timelines that align the calendars of Discipline Program Review with EMP objectives and actions steps implementation. (#2.8)
- Develop an annual EMP planning and assessment cycle. (#2.11)

For data capacity and a culture of evidence (CBT task #1, which ended January 1, 2013), CBT provided multiple recommendations regarding the alignment of KPIs with the EMP, planning priorities, decision making, and the use of evidence in the development of strategic, academic, and resource planning cycles.

Implementation of the above recommendations, which represent only selected recommendations from CBT's January 2013 reports, will provide some of the systematic components that constitute a continuous cycle of assessment and planning. Generally, during 2012-13, OCC has been developing the groundwork and some of the pieces for an integrated planning model. Another year, at a minimum, is needed to complete a model for a comprehensive organizational cyclic planning structure, tailored to the college's unique needs and strategies for student success.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Three sets of recommendations follow. First, long-term recommendations that were provided in the January 2013 progress report; second, "next steps" for the short-term that

were developed with the Executive Director of IRQ&P; and lastly, important activities that will require continuing and college-wide attention.

**The following recommendations were identified for OCC in the January 2013 progress report by CBT.** These recommendations, while not CBT's Integrated Planning final recommendations, remain important for OCC's future planning structure. It was found, however, that with the exception of #1 below which is being addressed through the EMP, these recommendations will be longer-term goals:

1. Articulate a clear vision for student success to provide direction and priorities for planning.
2. Revise the KPIs to reflect the measurement of clear goals for student success through the EMP and a strategic plan.
3. Identify all components of an integrated planning model that will need to be connected, as well as the calendar for each activity. Such components include institutional plans, both existing and in development, resource allocation processes, and assessment and evaluation processes. Specific components to coordinate include a strategic plan, the EMP, an updated technology plan, program review, equipment, human resources, facilities and capital expenditures, KPIs, Achieving the Dream (ATD) benchmarking, and department plans.
4. Combine the calendars of each of the identified components, and where possible, coordinate the calendars so that assessment informs plans; resource allocation is based on plan priorities; plans are evaluated and updated periodically; and department-level and college-level planning cycles are integrated connected.
5. Document the planning model in narrative and graphically so that the connections among planning components are apparent and clear.

**These important “next steps” for OCC were collaboratively identified by the Executive Director of IRQ&P and the CBT consultant team in May 2013, for short-term implementation:**

1. Develop a graphic model (perhaps using the Chaffey College example) to demonstrate the cascading relationship of various pending plans throughout the college. Depict the connections among a strategic plan/vision; the EMP, facilities, technology, human resources, and professional development plans; and implementation processes, including those including department plans. (Same as #5 above.)
2. Provide for strong connections between the existing EMP implementation teams and dean and departmental leadership, faculty, and activities. Faculty and staff need to be widely involved and consulted in EMP implementation in order to ensure coordination, engagement, and the success of the EMP.
3. Develop a college strategic plan, or strategic vision, to provide overarching institutional direction and to guide all plans. A brief college workshop, or “charette”, is one way to accomplish this, to communicate about planning, and to simultaneously involve stakeholders in planning activities.

4. Initiate supporting institutional plans for facilities, technology, human resources, professional development, and others TBD by the college.
5. Create a participatory, collaborative structure and process for college-wide planning, such as the College Planning Council provided.

**Finally, the following additional recommendations are provided by CBT. These will require intensive efforts and coordination of leadership across the college:**

1. Coordinate Academic Performance Review and Discipline Program Review with other college planning processes and plans. Disciplines and departments will need to create plans themselves that are informed by such data and self-evaluation, that reflect college-wide plans, and, conversely, that inform development of college-wide plans.
2. Resource allocation processes need yet to be aligned with planning at a variety of levels, including broadly among campuses (“Resource Allocation Model or RAM”), for divisions and disciplines/departments, and for each type of resource allocation process.