

Summary of Comments on College Brain Trust Reports and Administrative Documents

**Compiled by Shawn Dry, Academic Senate College Chair
Presented to the Academic Senate on October 24, 2013**

This document contains a summary of comments on the College Brain Trust reports and administrative documents that were shared with the college on July 16, 2013. The comments have been compiled from two sources: discussions held by Academic Senate standing committees in September and October 2013; and open forums held in October 2013 on each campus and moderated by an Academic Senate campus chair.

The comments are presented in a summary fashion and are organized by report. I have retained all original documentation should the specific provenance and original wording of any comment be required.

Child Care Assessment

- Some attendees recognized the financial necessity of eliminating or reducing the budget deficit created by the operation of child care centers.
- Concern was expressed over the process by which the decision to close the child care centers was made.
 - Was sufficient effort made to gather input from all relevant interested parties?
 - Were the suggestions made by the staff at the centers addressed, e.g. increased marketing?
 - Why did the administration not attempt to implement the CBT recommendations for improvement before making the decision to close the centers?
- The impact upon students with children and no other means of child care was a major concern. Why could the centers not have been phased out gradually to allow these student parents to make other arrangements? Could not the closures have waited until the projected potential arrangement with Oakland Schools had been pursued?
- Along these lines, attendees expressed concerns about OCC being run as a business rather than an educational institution serving its community.

Integrated Planning

- There was agreement that planning should be integrated and that plans should ultimately support the mission and vision of the college and be accompanied by a consistent planning cycle.
- Attendees strongly asserted that the creation of both the Integrated Planning Model and the plans themselves should be a collaborative rather than a top-down process. Mechanisms to enable the participation of the entire college community in the creation of both the planning model and the plans are essential to both the quality of the plans and their approval by the college community.
- Attendees disagreed with statements in the CBT report suggesting that neither planning nor the mechanisms to plan existed or were effective before 2012. CPC and CAMP worked for years to create the foundation upon which the current planning process exists.

- While attendees appreciated the CBT statement that college faculty and staff should be involved in the implementation of the EMP, they also asserted that similar involvement should exist for the creation and improvement of the EMP.

Data Capacity and Culture of Evidence

- Attendees agreed that data collection and use were essential to the planning and implementation process.
- Many questions and concerns about data were raised.
 - The need for data to support decisions must be universally applied in order to avoid the appearance of arbitrary decision-making.
 - Are data collected by IR the only ones that will be used to support planning and implementation?
 - What is the most effective means of sharing data with the institution? Can the Academic Senate presentation process be adjusted to make sharing data there more effective?
 - Some attendees shared their own personal experiences when data had been misused or misinterpreted.
- A common suggestion from the forums was the creation of an Academic Senate data committee to investigate the questions and concerns raised about data collection and use and to work with the administration to resolve them.

Benchmarking and Key Performance Indicators

- Attendees recognized the value of using appropriate institutions as benchmarking guides and establishing appropriate KPIs to measure progress.
- Attendees again asserted that college community involvement in the selection of benchmarking institutions and KPI development will be vital to ensuring quality and creating understanding and buy-in. The preference expressed was for inclusive, participatory processes rather than top-down administrative ones.