

# REVIEW OF THE CAMPUS ACADEMIC MASTER PLANS

Performed by the College Academic Master Plan Committee

Composed by Shawn Dry, Committee Chair

Submitted to the College Academic Senate on April 22, 2010

## REVIEW OBJECTIVES

As charged by the College Academic Senate, the College Academic Master Plan Committee performed a comprehensive review of the four Campus Academic Master Plans in the winter 2010 semester. The review was performed with two objectives in mind:

- 1. Help the campuses focus their efforts more effectively in the last few years of their current plans.** Most of the campuses are in the third year of their five-year plans, and much has changed since these plans were first developed. We therefore hoped to provide some large-scale perspective to the campus planning groups as they seek to implement the last phases of their plans.
- 2. Provide food for thought as the campuses contemplate extending or reworking their current plans.** At some point in the near future, the campuses will either be extending their current five-year plans to cover a longer period or will be engaging in a new planning process. Some campuses are already engaged in this endeavor. We therefore hoped to provide suggestions for improvement in direction and focus in their next phase of academic planning.

## REVIEW PROCESS

The review was performed in two phases. In the first phase, four subcommittees each took one of the campus plans and evaluated it extensively according to the following criteria:

- 1. Alignment with the Strategic Plan's priorities.** The college's Strategic Plan includes four strategic priorities for the 2009-2013 planning cycle: college readiness, transfer readiness, employment readiness, and student learning-focused resources. The subcommittees determined both what elements of the campus plans reflected the strategic priorities and what elements did not.
- 2. Alignment with the college's current and anticipated future financial situation.** The subcommittees noted elements of the campus plans that could be considered overly ambitious or unrealistic in light of the college's dwindling financial resources.

The second phase of the review involved reading through all of the campus plans and identifying **areas where the plans overlapped in potentially problematic ways.** Emphasis was placed on the efficient use of college resources and avoiding the duplication of effort.

## REVIEW RESULTS

The committee's observations are recorded on the following pages. Each campus plan is addressed individually; the comments on overlapping areas appear after them.

## AUBURN HILLS

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITIES

The recognized strength of the Auburn Hills academic master plan is its alignment with the strategic plan priority of employment readiness. The plan contains many strategies for both preparing OCC students for employment and strengthening workplace skill sets. Examples include strategies 1.3, 6.4b, 7.2, and 7.4.

The plan also adequately addresses the priorities of college readiness and student learning-focused resources. Strategies 5.10 and 5.11 address academic college readiness, and strategy 2.10 additionally speaks to the issue of social and emotional college readiness. Strategies 1.1, 1.6a, and 1.10 address the realignment of resources around student learning.

The one priority the plan appears to address in a more limited way is transfer readiness. While connections with four year institutions do occur (e.g., strategy 1.12), the Auburn Hills planning group may want to consider how to incorporate this important college mission more thoroughly in future incarnations of its academic plan.

One set of strategies stood out as unconnected to the strategic plan priorities--staff and faculty wellness (e.g., strategies 2.1 and 2.2). The committee recognizes that it is not necessary for every strategy of the plan to align perfectly with one of the four strategic priorities. In addition, the committee understands that each campus will produce academic plans that reflect the unique character and atmosphere of that campus and its students, faculty, and staff. Having said that, the committee recommends that the Auburn Hills planning group consider carefully whether each strategy that does not align with one of the strategic priorities enhances achievement of the college's priority statement ("Learning is our only priority.") or could potentially detract from it.

### ALIGNMENT WITH FINANCIAL REALITIES

The committee recommends that the Auburn Hills planning group evaluate each of the following strategies or groups of strategies with a "cost-benefit analysis" perspective. In other words, please consider carefully if the cost of pursuing these strategies can be justified with an adequate benefit in a student learning-centered institution. The committee is not presuming that the answer in each case will be no. It is merely highlighting strategies that would seem to call for careful consideration.

- Team building course (strategy 7.11)
- Guest speakers (strategies 20 and 22)
- Facilities upgrades (strategies 1.7 and 2.7)
- Curriculum and staffing increases (strategies 5.3, 5.10, and 6.9)

# HIGHLAND LAKES

## ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITIES

The Highland Lakes academic master plan demonstrates strong alignment with three of the four strategic priorities: college readiness, transfer readiness, and employment readiness.

An equal number of strategies address college readiness (e.g., strategies 1.9.1, 2.4, and 2.6.8) and employment readiness (e.g., strategies 2.5, 3.3, and 4.4). The plan contains a particularly strong focus on preparing students for careers in the health professions. Transfer readiness is addressed in strategies 1.4.1, 1.8, and 2.6.9.

The one priority the plan appears to address in a more limited way is student learning-focused resources. While an argument could be made that every strategy is student learning-focused, few strategies speak to realigning campus resources to focus them more directly on student learning. Exceptions are strategies 2.1 and 2.6.10. The Highland Lakes planning group may want to consider how to incorporate this priority more thoroughly in future incarnations of its academic plan.

A number of strategies stood out as unconnected to the strategic plan priorities. These include increased interdisciplinary connections (e.g., strategies 1.3.1 and 3.3.1), an increased global awareness emphasis (e.g., strategies 1.6 and 2.8), community connections (e.g., strategies 4.1 and 4.2.1), and recruitment (e.g., strategy 4.7). The committee recognizes that it is not necessary for every strategy of the plan to align perfectly with one of the four strategic priorities. In addition, the committee understands that each campus will produce academic plans that reflect the unique character and atmosphere of that campus and its students, faculty, and staff. Having said that, the committee recommends that the Highland Lakes planning group consider carefully whether each strategy that does not align with one of the strategic priorities enhances achievement of the college's priority statement ("Learning is our only priority.") or could potentially detract from it.

## ALIGNMENT WITH FINANCIAL REALITIES

The committee recommends that the Highland Lakes planning group evaluate each of the following strategies or groups of strategies with a "cost-benefit analysis" perspective. In other words, please consider carefully if the cost of pursuing these strategies can be justified with an adequate benefit in a student learning-centered institution. The committee is not presuming that the answer in each case will be no. It is merely highlighting strategies that would seem to call for careful consideration.

- Guest speakers and events (strategies 2.8.1 and 2.8.4)
- Facilities upgrades (strategies 1.4, 2.3, 2.6.11, and 3.5)
- Curriculum and staffing increases (strategies 1.1, 2.7.1, and 3.1.3)
- Community activities (strategy 4.2)

## ORCHARD RIDGE

### ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITIES

The recognized strength of the Orchard Ridge academic master plan is its alignment with the strategic plan priority of employment readiness. The plan contains many strategies for both preparing OCC students for employment and strengthening workplace skill sets. Examples include strategies and objectives 1.3.2, 1.4, and 2.1.

The plan also adequately addresses the priorities of college readiness and student learning-focused resources. Objectives 4.1 and 4.2 address college readiness, and strategies 8.2.2, 8.2.8, 8.3.2, and 8.3.8 address the realignment of resources around student learning.

The one priority the plan appears to address in a more limited way is transfer readiness. Objective 1.1 speaks to connections and articulation agreements with four year institutions, and objective 1.2 indicates review of the liberal arts curriculum, which is the primary transfer program and most granted degree at OCC. The Orchard Ridge planning group may want to consider how to incorporate this important college mission more thoroughly in future incarnations of its academic plan.

A number of strategies stood out as unconnected to the strategic plan priorities. These include increased involvement in participatory governance (objective 8.1), health and wellness relationships with the community (objective 3.1), and permanent athletic teams (strategy 5.1.5). The committee recognizes that it is not necessary for every strategy of the plan to align perfectly with one of the four strategic priorities. In addition, the committee understands that each campus will produce academic plans that reflect the unique character and atmosphere of that campus and its students, faculty, and staff. Having said that, the committee recommends that the Orchard Ridge planning group consider carefully whether each strategy that does not align with one of the strategic priorities enhances achievement of the college's priority statement ("Learning is our only priority.") or could potentially detract from it.

### ALIGNMENT WITH FINANCIAL REALITIES

The committee recommends that the Orchard Ridge planning group evaluate each of the following strategies or groups of strategies with a "cost-benefit analysis" perspective. In other words, please consider carefully if the cost of pursuing these strategies can be justified with an adequate benefit in a student learning-centered institution. The committee is not presuming that the answer in each case will be no. It is merely highlighting strategies that would seem to call for careful consideration.

- Community activities and events (objectives 3.1, 6.2, and 7.1)
- Facilities and equipment upgrades (objective 7.2 and strategies 8.2.4, 8.3.4, 8.3.6, and 8.3.9)

## **SOUTHEAST (ROYAL OAK AND SOUTHFIELD)**

### **ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PLAN PRIORITIES**

The recognized strength of the Southeast academic master plan is its alignment with the strategic plan priorities of college readiness and employment readiness. Strategies 1.3.2, 2.4.1, 3.3.2, and 6.1.1 address college readiness, and strategies 2.2.1, 3.3.2, 5.5.1, and 8.2.1 speak to employment readiness.

While the Southeast plan does not directly address transfer readiness in the sense of establishing relationships with four year institutions, strategies do call for student training in technology (3.3.2) and the creation of student learning centers (8.3.1). These strategies serve the dual purpose of preparing students to succeed both at OCC (i.e., college readiness) and whatever institution to which they may transfer (i.e., transfer readiness). However, the Southeast planning group may want to consider how to more directly incorporate this important college mission in future incarnations of its academic plan.

Another priority the plan appears to address in a more limited way is student learning-focused resources. While an argument could be made that every strategy is student learning-focused, few strategies speak to realigning campus resources to focus them more directly on student learning. Potential exceptions are the strategies affiliated with goal 4, which address seeking additional funding for campus projects. Once again, the Southeast planning group may want to consider how to incorporate this priority more thoroughly in future incarnations of its academic plan.

Two areas of the Southeast plan stood out as unconnected to the strategic plan priorities. The first is the campus' communication protocol to establish connections with local, state, and federal authorities (strategy 1.2.1); the second is the set of sustainability strategies affiliated with goal 9. The committee recognizes that it is not necessary for every strategy of the plan to align perfectly with one of the four strategic priorities. In addition, the committee understands that each campus will produce academic plans that reflect the unique character and atmosphere of that campus and its students, faculty, and staff. Having said that, the committee recommends that the Southeast planning group consider carefully whether each strategy that does not align with one of the strategic priorities enhances achievement of the college's priority statement ("Learning is our only priority.") or could potentially detract from it.

### **ALIGNMENT WITH FINANCIAL REALITIES**

The committee recommends that the Southeast planning group evaluate each of the following strategies or groups of strategies with a "cost-benefit analysis" perspective. In other words, please consider carefully if the cost of pursuing these strategies can be justified with an adequate benefit in a student learning-centered institution. The committee is not presuming that the answer in each case will be no. It is merely highlighting strategies that would seem to call for careful consideration.

- Increased campus service hours (strategy 3.2.2)
- Faculty and staff training (strategies 5.4.1, 6.1.2, 7.1.3, and 8.3.2)
- Facilities upgrades (strategies 7.1.2, 7.2.2, 8.3.1, and 8.5.1)
- Sustainability strategies (goal 9)

## CAMPUS PLAN OVERLAP

The committee has identified five areas in which two or more campus academic master plans may be unnecessarily duplicating effort and/or expense. The five areas are listed below, along with the relevant campus plan strategies that address them.

### 1. Articulation Agreements with Four Year Institution

- AH 1.12
- HL 1.5, 1.5.1, 1.8, 1.8.1
- OR 1.1

### 2. Emerging Sectors Training and Relationships

- AH 7.2, 7.4
- HL 2.5
- OR 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 6.3
- SE 2.3, 5.1, 5.3

### 3. New Student Orientation and First Year Experience

- AH 1.2
- OR 4.1.4, 4.24

### 4. K-12 Relationships

- AH 5.11
- HL 1.4.1, 4.5, 4.5.1
- OR 6.1, 7.2.1
- SE 1.3, 2.4

### 5. Developmental Education

- AH 5.3, 5.5, 5.8, 5.9a, 7.10
- HL 1.9, 2.6
- OR 4.2
- SE 6.3

The committee does not believe that any of these strategies or endeavors should necessarily be abandoned. On the contrary, the committee recognizes that each of them is in alignment with one of the four strategic plan priorities. The committee is rather encouraging the campuses involved in each area to consider a more cooperative, college-wide approach. Such an approach should involve resource sharing and communication among those working on each campus in order to avoid duplication of effort and expense. In addition, this approach may also entail the identification of central or college-level oversight, standardized approaches and methodologies, and communal access to and incorporation of old research and effort.