

**College Planning Council
Response to CBT Report
March 2012**

At the February 2012 CPC meeting, Dr. Holcomb provided an overview of the Report to the College prepared by the College Brain Trust (CBT). At the March meeting, CPC had a discussion about the recommendations. This document has been created to represent a summation of the feedback from the College Planning Council regarding the CBT's review of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations.

Introduction - Project Overview

The foundation for needed change as recommended by CBT was somewhat unclear. For example, the impetus for change as outlined by the CBT appeared to be based on funding shortfalls and a period of 'volatile change'. This premise did not seem particularly accurate as the overarching reason for recommended action. In addition, some of the proposed changes have already been incorporated.

Introduction – Methodology

It was unclear to some CPC members what is meant by "a representative group of faculty" as they felt that representatives were chosen to represent the group; the faculty did not choose with whom CBT interviewed and/or met. Other feedback regarding representativeness of those who spoke with CBT was that it was unclear who was consulted, including question of why the Campus Academic Planning Committees were not interviewed.

CULTURE OF EVIDENCE

Positive responses

- There certainly are some people in the college who do not know what to do with data.
- A culture of inquiry and evidence should and will be incorporated in the College Academic Master Plan (CAMP), utilizing hard targets and routine practices.
- A specific group should and will be identified to oversee the data-based achievements of the CAMP.
- A regular data preparation activity should be incorporated into the CPC annual cycle (as has been proposed at CPC in the past).
- "How to use data workshops" could be beneficial.
- The list of strengths was impressive.
- Closer ties with IR and OAE could be valid.

Negative responses

- CAMP development did follow a comprehensive information gathering and internal/external scan; it was called redesign. To repeat this process would have been frustrating and overly delaying.
- CPC has already created data-driven measurements in the Strategic Plan KPIs and regularly reviews the results.
- The curriculum review process has just been developed and should be given some time to function.

- CBT indicated that IR does not come up with annual reports of various points of information. This is incorrect as, for example, IR distributes a report outlining the number of graduates per program.
- Some were unclear about the meaning of the term ‘culture of evidence.’
- A few of the recommendations seemed unclear and action steps to accomplish these tasks are not provided. For example, it is unclear what the purpose of some of the proposed committees would be.

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Positive responses

- The community engagement process is indeed uncoordinated, as the senate CAMP committee identified several years ago.
- The proposed CBT model of community engagement could be useful, though experts in the field of engagement should review it.
- Challenges mentioned in the area of “community engagement” can be easily solved through stronger marketing and PR at the college level. This should be addressed in the master plan to deal with transparency issues and reach out to the external community.

Negative

- There should be caution about proceeding with a college wide agenda if it will impede the work of the campuses.
- Some of the recommendations seem unrealistic given our current culture.

CAPACITY FOR PLANNING

Positive responses

- Transparency and accountability do need to be enhanced. Great strides in that direction have occurred in the current CAMP process.
- The Strategic Plan has had confusion regarding terminology; greater consistency has occurred in the recent past and should continue to be encouraged.
- Classified staff have been practically (not intentionally) excluded from academic planning; efforts to correct that have occurred in the current CAMP process.
- The connections between strategic and academic planning on the one hand and other college “groups” (IT, human resources, facilities, etc.) on the other hand have been sporadic and inconsistent. Awareness of this was one of the driving forces behind the current CAMP process.
- Resource allocation has typically not been a part of academic planning.
- The program and discipline review process could be streamlined, but a new process has just been developed and needs time to get up to speed.
- CPC was created to assume the responsibility for college planning activities. At one point CPC was discussing how to integrate all the plans, etc. This process has stalled over the last several years.
- Agreement in general with these statements.

Negative responses

- The Strategic Plan does provide a formal framework for institutional planning. Campus plans have been aligned with Strategic Plan outcomes and priorities for years, and now the CAMP is following the same model.

- Campus plans absolutely do reflect a college-wide perspective. There is some variability in terminology and plan format across the campuses (which the senate CAMP committee is working to redress), but there are very clear links between every campus plan and the strategic plan. A document exists that demonstrates these links.
- Campus planning does not always receive adequate recognition for their work and a reporting frame work has been lacking.
- CPC was designed to be the formal framework for institutional planning.
- Some agree that the problem is that we need effective system-wide leadership. Others disagree that the autonomy of the campuses negatively impacts governance and operational efficiency.

Conclusions

- Many CBT observations concerning data, involvement, communication, and plan alignment and integration already have been or are being incorporated into the current CAMP process.
- Coordination of external connections has already been identified as a critical component of the new CAMP.
- The senate curriculum review committee should be given time to test out the new program and discipline review model it has recently developed and is currently piloting.

Additional thoughts on recommendations:

- There is agreement that the college community is skeptical in participating and working on their campus plans and this is a problem due to a lack of/and changing of common language. Also agreement that many of the college committees are not linked well.
- There was no assessment of our technology resources which are pertinent in achieving many college goals and plans, such as student communication and classroom instruction.
- The College Planning Council also considered the general usefulness of this report to the College community. For example, some of the recommendations cited by CBT were considered current or ongoing work of the college and therefore, not relevant in identifying meaningful next steps.