ORCHARD RIDGE CAMPUS RESPONSE

to

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

1992-94

FORWARD

As a dynamic, continuously improving learning-centered community, Orchard Ridge will emphasize the following strategies for academic years 1992-93. We have chosen to focus our attention in two primary areas - assessment and competencies. It is through activity in these two areas that we can achieve those objectives outlined in our preamble.

Learning is at the heart of student success. Successful students are successful learners who identify, commit to, and attain their education goals. They acquire and demonstrate the skills, knowledge, attitudes and self-direction needed to perform ethically and productively in society, to adapt to change, to appreciate diversity, and to make a reasoned commitment on issues of importance.

To achieve this definition of student success the College must have a precise awareness of exactly who its students are and what steps to success it needs to provide--and a willingness to continually assess and improve those steps. (Promoting Student Success in the Community College, an NCIA Position Statement.)

Further, to be a dynamic, continuously improving learning-centered community, Orchard Ridge needs pervasive professionalism with appropriate reward and resource systems. Only then can we maintain mutual respect based on excellence and integrity.

ASSESSMENT

The Orchard Ridge Response will be:
A systematic, comprehensive approach to evaluation and outcome measurement on the part of each community member. (Strategic Directions 1,3,4)

Campus Strategy #1
Orchard Ridge will develop a comprehensive assessment program to better understand the competencies and educational aspirations of our students.

Implementation Tactic:
The campus administration and interested faculty, working with the Office of Institutional Planning will develop/maintain instruments appropriate for this task. They will also develop a calendar of events for data collection, interpretation, and dissemination.

Campus Strategy #2
Orchard Ridge will continue to assess and improve their student orientation program.

Implementation Tactic:
Strengthen the academic component and increase the role of faculty and administration in the Fall 1992 orientation. A dialog group will be established to identify the necessary academic components.

Campus Strategy #3
Orchard Ridge will continue the development of criteria for course placement. Placement will be expanded beyond Math, English and the College Skills program.

Implementation Tactic:
In light of College-wide activities in this arena, the campus will continue with its efforts to implement and broaden its College Skills program, and to develop curriculum and course proposals designed to meet the developmental needs of our students.

CORE COMPETENCIES

The Orchard Ridge Response will be:
> The identification of core competencies for all curricula, and the systematic implementation of learning outcomes. (Strategic Directions 1,4)

Campus Strategy #1
Based on assessment and College Senate recommendations, Orchard Ridge will identify core competencies for all curricula.

Implementation Tactic:
The academic staff will continue to support and participate in the College-wide initiatives for core competencies.

Campus Strategy #2
Academic departments will identify course learning outcomes for their discipline.

Implementation Tactic:
Each academic staff member, with the appropriate Dean, will develop or obtain appropriate formative assessment methods designed to measure student growth and mastery. Sample experimental instruments will be identified and administered in the departments most populous or appropriate course in the Fall 1992 semester.

Campus Strategy #3
Following the implementation of the two previous strategies, the academic staff will develop and/or modify their current instructional practice to focus on providing the appropriate educational opportunities to help students attain the desired competencies.

Campus Strategy #3 cont'd.

Implementation Tactics:
As part of the College initiative, campus efforts will continue in the following areas:

> Curriculum development through the disciplines
> Classroom research activities sponsored and supported by the campus
> Establishment of core competency groups to work across disciplines for implementation.

Campus Strategy #4
Academic staff will identify and implement programs to prepare instructors to develop skills and techniques required to implement instructional/ curricular changes.

Implementation Tactic:
Campus Administration will identify a staff person and the appropriate financial resources to support such programs.
It is recommended that such a program should be built around new faculty orientation and "Coffee and Croissants" program in the Fall term.

Campus Strategy #5
Academic staff will develop assessment programs to evaluate student progress at entry, during and after each course, and at the end of the certain sequences of courses.

Implementation Tactic:
The Academic Deans will take leadership, in cooperation with the department chairs, in identifying the process and developing a timetable for implementation.

Campus Strategy #6
Instructional Support services for diverse student learning styles and instructional strategies will continue to be reviewed and revised.

Implementation Tactic:
Academic Deans in conjunction with appropriate staff, will continue to work to ensure cooperation and mutual support among all the academic support activities on campus, including the IIC, LRC, ELI, Special Needs and College Skills.

ASSESSMEN

INSTITUTIONAL
EFFECTIVENESS

College/ Institution	Campus	Discipline Cluster	Discipline	C

$<$------------------------------ ------------------ ------------------- ------------------ -------

-Macro level.
-Critical Success Factors
 driven to more specific
 detail which increases cost
 proportionally.
-Institutional Planning &
Analysis.

Note: EMET is currently designed to provide assessment based information which pertains to the Co
        and in some situations Program Option level. This will allow for continuous monitoring o
        Assessment (conducted by faculty) is the remaining component in the assessment process at
        College Academic Senate and are in the process of being incorporated into curriculum acro

        This model employs multiple measures and indicators of college performance. Informati
        Directions, campus and area Strategies, departmental Operational Plans, and Budgets. In ac

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INDICATORS OF CRITICAL SUCCESS

I.   STUDENT OUTCOMES:

1.   *Student Satisfaction Index as ▲a composite of:*

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
1.1	Student's annual rating of: if they were to start over again, their propensity to choose OCC.	CSS, NRS, GES, GFS	2*, 2*, 2*, 3	Col, Cmp,
1.2	Percent of their instructors who they rate as making special efforts to be available for individual help.	FTS, CSS, NRS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
1.3	Percent of all their courses they would describe as worthwhile.	FTS, CSS, GES, GFS, NRS	2*, 2*, 2*, 3, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org
1.4	Percent of students' describing OCC as an exciting place to be.	FTS, CSS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
1.5	Retention rate.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

2.   *Graduate Satisfaction Index as a composite of:*

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
2.1	Percent of graduates very satisfied with their OCC educational experience.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
2.2	Percent of graduates very satisfied with support services.	GES, GFS	2*, 1	Col, Cmp, Org
2.3	Graduation rate (% of the intake cohort who have graduated).	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
2.4	Percent of graduates who; if they were to start over again, would choose OCC and the same program.	GFS	3	Col, Cmp, Org
2.5	Percent of graduates who expect to return to OCC for upgrading.	GES, GFS, SUS	2*, 1, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org
2.6	Percent of these intended upgraders who do return to OCC.	MAF-SIS, GES, GFS, SUS	2, 2*, 2, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org

3. *Student Feedback Index* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
3.1	Percent of graduates responding to OCC follow-up survey.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
3.2	Percent of course enrollees who could have completed an IDEA evaluation and did.	MAF-SIS, IDEA	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org

4. *Student Demand Index* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
4.1	Re-enrollment rate (% of all students retained from semester to semester).	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Smp, Org
4.2	Application rate (% of potential applicant pool in the community who applied).	MAF-SIS BOC	2, 2	Col, Cmp (2)
4.3	Catchment rate (% of potential applicant pool in the community who registered).	MAF-SIS BOC	2, 2	Col, Cmp (2)
4.4	Number of first-time registrants.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp (2)
4.5	First-timers as a % of total registrants.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp (2)
4.6	Percent of first-timers rating OCC as their first choice institution.	ADM	3	Col, Cmp (2)
4.7	Rapidity-of-section-fill rate (% of all offered sections filled by "X" day in the registration process).	MAF-SIS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
4.8	SCH from first-time students as % of total SCH.	MAF-SIS	2	Col,Comp, Org
4.9	Average number of OCC credits completed per OCC "leaver."	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

5. *First Impressions Index* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
5.1	First-time students ratings of their first impressions of OCC (including their evaluations of OCC services they received in applying and registering).	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,

6. *Course Evaluation Index* as a composite of (IDEA data on):   SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
6.1	Percent who would like to take another course from this instructor.	IDEA	2	Col, Cmp, Org
6.2	"Methods" evaluations (with the exception of items on "involving students") *see IDEA summary report.*	IDEA	2	Col, Cmp, Org

7. *Overall Student Satisfaction Index* as a composite of all of the above: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
7.1	*Note: the opportunity here, and for other indicators, to elicit specific purposes comparisons, such as the impact of faculty overload sections on satisfaction indices.*	NA	3	Col, Cmp, Org

8. *Transfer Index* composed of % of graduates who enrolled, within twelve months: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
8.1	At an in-state college.	GFS/TRS/MA CRAO, NRS	2, 3, 2, 2*	Col (3)
8.2	At an in or out-of state college.	GFS/TRS, NRS	2, 3, 2*	Col (3)
8.3	At either type of college having originally intended to transfer to a college.	ADM, GFS/TRS/MA CRAO	3, 2, 2, 3	Col (3)
8.4	At either type of college, but limited to those whose OCC grades made them eligible for admission to - which institutions *(using, here, the normal cut-off college GPA, not one which may have risen in recent years in response to enrollment quotas).*	GFS/TRS MAF-SIS	2, 3, 2	Col (3)
8.5	OCC share of total college transfer admissions by - same institution(s).	MDE, MACRAO	2, 2, 2	Col (3)
8.6	Percent increase/decrease, for OCC "leaving cohort", in numbers who, by comparison with their original OCC admission status, retained/attained university eligibility while at OCC.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
8.7	University degree completion rates.	MDE/TRS	3	Col (3)
8.8	Graduate ratings of their preparedness for transfer.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
8.9	OCC "leavers" gains/losses in GPA by university faculty, in their first year at university (OCC GPA compared to university GPA).	MAF-SIS, TRS	2, 3	Col (3)

9. *Graduate Placement Index* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
9.1	Percent of job seekers who have had a definitely or somewhat training-related job sometime in the nine months following graduation.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
9.2	Percent of graduates who are still in a training related job nine months after graduation.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
9.3	Percent of "placed" graduates very satisfied with the relevance of their educational experience.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
9.4	Average length of job search period of those employed full-time in training-related jobs.	GFS	1	Col, Cmp, Org
9.5	Average salaries in training-related jobs *(Note: Methodological limitations need to be overcome in order for use of these last two indicators).*	GFS, BLS, MESC	2, 3, 3	Col, Cmp, Org

...and compare both of these indices to their probabilities of successful outcomes via...

10. *Transfer Probability Index* comprised of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
10.1	Trends in university admissions of college transfers.	MACRAO/TRS	3, 2	Col (3)
10.2	State-wide "likely-to-transfers" (competition for the available spaces) as inferred from state-level college enrollments in transfer studies.	MACRAO	2	Col (3)
10.3	Number of student credit hours OCC graduates earned in OCC courses which are recognized for transfer credit by the main university(s) which OCC students transfer to.	MAF-SIS/TRS	2	Col (3)
10.4	OCC leaving cohort academic ability (inferred from OCC ASSET test scores when first admitted).	MAF-SIS, NRS, SUS	2, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org
10.5	Relative OCC leaving cohort academic ability (inferred by comparing OCC ASSET scores with those from other state colleges...here, again, from when first admitted).	PIS	3	Col, Cmp (4)

(Note: Statistical testing of the data revealed no significant correlations of ASSET test scores and graduates' propensities to transfer. This implies that either; transfer rates are unaffected by academic ability; or the effects of academic ability on transfer are other than the ones tested. Initial conclusion is the latter. For example: they may be correlated with the propensity of an intake cohort to survive their OCC studies. Further testing is required before the need to include academic ability in this "probabilistic" index can be confirmed.)

11.   *Placement Probability Index* comprised of: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
11.1	Trends in unemployment rates in main geographic areas into which OCC graduates are normally placed (specifically by age, gender and broad program area).	MESC, GFS	3, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
11.2	Trends in OCC ASSET test scores.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
11.3	Trends in OCC shares of occupational outputs (inferred by comparing OCC SCH's in occupational programs to state-level volumes in main geographic regions into which OCC graduates are normally placed).	MAF-SIS, GFS, MESC, MDE	2, 2, 3, 3	Col, Cmp, Org

(Note: Statistical testing of the data revealed no significant correlations of ASSET test scores and placement rates nor rates of skill use on the job. Further discussion and hypothesis testing is required before the need to include academic ability in this "probabilistic" index can be confirmed.)

12. *Index of Emphases on General Education Skills Development* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
12.1	Students' annual ratings of the cognitive emphases of their courses (total number of written assignments, exams).	FTS, CSS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
12.2	Number of these from which the student received detailed feedback from their instructor(s).	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
12.3	Percent of their courses in which substantial reading was required (as rated by the students).	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
12.4	Percent of their courses in which substantial writing was required.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
12.5	Percent of their courses which had a substantial amount of in-class discussion of the course material.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
12.6	Total student credit hours scheduled into computer labs.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.7	Average hours of scheduled office hours/instructor.	ISS, FTS, CSS	2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org
12.8	Average class sizes/discipline and percent above/below per institution (weighted for differences in disciplinary mix).	MAF-SIS, MDE	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.9	Percent of all OCC students whose academic abilities OCC could assess prior to admission (percent with High School transcripts and/or ASSET test scores).	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.10	Percent of all faculty rating as important in their course(s) "developing skill in expressing oneself" orally or in writing (from IDEA data).	IDEA, ISS	2, 3	Col, Cmp, Org
12.11	Percent of students reporting that their course(s) required more reading and other assignments than most of their other courses (from IDEA data, and dependent on how normalized the current distribution of responses is).	IDEA	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.12	Percent of OCC students whose course loads in past 12 months included an English course.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.13	Percent of OCC students whose course loads in past 12 months included a Math course.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
12.14	Percent of OCC students whose course loads in past 12 months included a computing course.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

13a. *Skill Gains Index* comprised of: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
13a.1	Standardized test scores of academic ability taken at admission compared to standardized test scores at end of first semester, compared to standardized test scores at end of fourth 'consecutive' semester (i.e. enrolled in Sept, Jan, Sept, Jan...or Sept, Jan, May, Sept)	MAF-SIS	3	Col, Cmp, Org
13a.2	Percent of the intake cohort surviving these enrollment patterns and therefore testable...and tested.	MAF-SIS	3	Col, Cmp, Org

OR

13b. *Index of Self-Reported Skill Gains* as a composite of: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
13b.1	Students' self-reported rates of skills gains in reading, writing, computational, computer, teamwork, and oral communications.	FTS, CSS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp
13b.2	Controlled for their entry ASSET scores and/or high school grade point averages.	MAF-SIS FTS, CSS	2, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org
13b.3	And controlled for the number of credits and semesters completed at OCC when the skill gains were reported.	MAF-SIS FTS, CSS	2, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org

14. *Index of Student Goal Clarification and Attainment* as a composite of: SOURCE   STATUS   LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
14.1	Percent of students reporting gains in the clarity of their educational goals at end of the winter term.	FTS, CSS, NRS	2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp
14.2	Relation of these gains to the length of time and number of credits attempted at OCC, students' original stated educational goals, and the students' original confidence in the clarity of their educational goals.	ADM, REG MAF-SIS, CSS, NRS	3, 3, 2, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
14.3	Percent of graduates reporting, nine months after graduation, that hey have achieved their short term educational goal(s).	GFS	3	Col, Cmp, Org

II. RESOURCE VIABILITY:

15. *Index of Affordability for Students* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
15.1	OCC student aid index (calculated from Pell Grant data) and percent of OCC students included in that index.	MAF-FAS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
15.2	Inflation adjusted total student fee/student (tuition, materials, etc.) by student load.	MAF-SIS, BLS,FAS.	2, 3	Col, Cmp, Org
15.3	Inflation adjusted total student aid available, via OCC, per student by student load.	MAF-SIS, BLS,FAS	2, 3	Col, Cmp, Org
15.4	Inflation adjusted total student aid awarded, via OCC, per student by student load.	MAF-SIS, BLS,FAS	2, 3	Col, Cmp, Org
15.5	Estimates of price elasticity derived from: comparisons of these data to the socio-economic demography of OCC student population, and an index of the price vs. quality factors affecting students' choices to select OCC over other institutions.	CSS, POP	2*, 3	Col, Cmp,

16.	*Index of Gross Unit Operating Costs* as a composite of:	SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
16.1	Inflation.	BLS	3	Col
16.2	Gross costs per student contact or credit hour (operating funds only).	MAF-SIS-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.3	Percent OCC varies from Michigan college system average gross costs per student contact or credit hour (also, operating funds only).	MDE(ACS)	2	Col
16.4	OCC average faculty workload (SCH/FTE instructor).	MAF-SIS-HRS	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.5	Number of student credit hours delivered via faculty overloads.	MAF-HRS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.6	Average cost saving/SCH from faculty workload overloads.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.7	Total overall discounting of OCC gross costs/SCH attributable to faculty overload.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.8	Percent OCC varies from Michigan college system average faculty workload.	MDE(ACS)	2	Col, Cmp
16.9	OCC average faculty salary cost/FTE instructor.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
16.10	Percent OCC varies from Michigan college system average faculty salary cost/FTE instructor.	MDE(ACS)	2	Col
16.11	Estimates of faculty age and position-on-scale impacts on OCC/state comparisons and trends in those comparisons.	MDE	3	Col, Cmp

17.	*Index of Cost Flexibility* as a composite of:	SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
17.1	OCC ratio of fixed variable operating costs and comparisons of these to Michigan system averages.	MDE(ACS)	2	Col, Cmp
17.2	OCC mix of operating and non-operating revenues.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
17.3	Percents of non-operating revenues deployed in achieving functional objectives of the strategic plan.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

(Note: This data is to be organized and presented in ways which facilitates two views of OCC's costs and revenues...one which views things "strategically" (by functional objective) and one which views things "operationally" (by operating department). This will facilitate achievement of strategic planning objectives via adjustments in operating appropriations.)

18. *Index of OCC Space Entitlements* as a composite of: SOURCE STATUS LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
18.1	An index of OCC's intensity of space use (weekly student contact hours per net assignable square feet) compared to OCC space standards (calculated based on WICHE standards for same).	MAF	3	Col, Cmp, Org
18.2	An index of OCC's crowdedness of space (net assignable square feet per student station in classrooms and also in labs) compared to OCC space standards (again, derived from WICHE standards).	MAF	3	Col, Cmp, Org
18.3	And an index comparing OCC's mix of instructional and support space mixes to WICHE standards for same.	MAF	3	Col, Cmp, Org
18.4	Inferring from comparisons of these OCC space inventory data to OCC space standards OCC's NASF entitlements.	MAF	3	Col, Cmp, Org

(Note: The standards of the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) are recommended, on the assumption that state standards either do not exist or do exist and largely resemble WICHE's. This needs to be confirmed as part of the work to develop and implement the space standards to which OCC will plan.)

19. *Index of OCC Plan Implementation*, which displays: SOURCE STATUS LEVEL

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
19.1	The percent variance between budgeted and actual incremental changes, by function (relying on functions which most closely approximate the objectives enunciated in the OCC Strategic Plan) and cost center.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org (1)
19.2	The actual incremental changes in expenditures for these same functions.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
19.3	Percent variance between planned and actual incremental changes in variable (as opposed to fixed) expenditures, by function and cost center.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

III.   COMMUNITY INTEGRATION:

20.   *Index of Student Involvement in Learning* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
20.1	Question 35 from the IDEA course evaluation (student ratings of how hard they worked in their courses).	IDEA, FTS, CSS	2, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org (1)
20.2	Number of library borrowings/student credit hour.	MAF-SIS, IPEDS	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
20.3	Average number of OCC credits attempted per student per semester and percent of these completed.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
Based on an annual end-of-term student experiences survey which gauge the frequency with which OCC students:		....	....	....
20.4	Meet with their instructors during office hours.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col. Cmp,
20.5	Had instructors who made special efforts to be available for individual help.	FTS, CSS, NRS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.6	Had valuable out-of-class assignments.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.7	Found interesting things to do on campus.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.8	Did things with a group of student outside of class times.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.9	Used the campus facilities to read, study or do research.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.10	Felt intellectually stimulated by the material covered in class	FTS, CSS, NRS, GES	2*, 2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.11	Put a lot of effort into their course work.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.12	Got valuable feedback on their course work from their instructors.	FTS, CSS	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,
20.13	Used tutorial services.	FTS, CSS, GES, SUS	2*, 2*, 2*, 2*	Col, Cmp,

(Note: It is recommended that comparisons between this raw index and an equivalent version weighted by the credits attempted by the respondents be used. This weighted version would display the same index, but cast in the context of total volumes of instruction (as opposed to total number of students taught by OCC.)

21. *Index of OCC's Reputation in the Community* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
21.1	Percent of OCC regional population who have attended OCC.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.2	OCC share of post-secondary participation rate of OCC regional population.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.3	Percent of OCC regional population who have a family member or friend who has attended OCC.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.4	Percent of OCC regional population who would support an increase in millage to finance further improvements in OCC programs and services.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.5	Percent of OCC regional population who perceive OCC as a 'quality institution'.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.6	Percent intending to take some further education in the next year.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.7	Percent of those rating OCC as their first choice for that further education.	POP	2	Col, Cmp
21.8	Percent of all OCC students who are first vs. second generation post-secondary attendees.	ADM	3	Col, Cmp,
21.9	Percent of all OCC students who are first vs. second generation OCC attendees.	ADM	3	Col, Cmp,
21.10	Percent of alumni who have made donations to the OCC Foundation, by graduating class.	MAF-SIS OCC Foundation	3	Col, Cmp, Org
21.11	Total fund raising income (other than interest income on existing funds).	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
21.12	Percent of total OCC academic courses with credits transferrable to -institution(s).	MAF-SIS ?	2	Col, Cmp, Org

(Note: Determination of this last rate will require establishment of main institutions OCC students will be destined for...and to examine credit transferability vis-a-vis those identified institutions.)

22. *Index of the Match Between OCC and Its Community* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
22.1	Demography of student population compared to demography of OCC region.	MAF-SIS, BOC	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
22.2	Demography of OCC employees compared to demography of available labor force.	MAF-HRS, BOC	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org

23. *Index of OCC's Presence in the Community,* **and vice versa, as a composite of:**　　　　　SOURCE　　STATUS　　LEVEL

23.1	Number of employers serving as members of OCC program advisory committees.		3	Col, Cmp, Org
23.2	Percent of these who attended a program advisory committee meeting in the past twelve months.		3	Col, Cmp, Org
23.3	Number of OCC employees serving on outside committees or boards which have a connection to their work at OCC.	ISS, STF	2*, 2*	Col, Cmp, Org

24. *Index of Employer Satisfaction* **as a composite of:**　　　　　SOURCE　　STATUS　　LEVEL

24.1	Number of individual employers serving on OCC Program Advisory Committees.		3	Col, Cmp, Org
24.2	Percent of program advisory committee members reporting, each year, that OCC made special efforts to elicit and act on their advise for program improvements.	EMP	3	Col, Cmp, Org
24.3	Percent of program advisory committee members rating their OCC program as an "exemplary program".	EMP	3	Col, Cmp, Org

IV.　CONTINIOUS RENEWAL AND IMPROVEMENT:

25. *Employee Renewal and Improvement Index* **as a composite of:**　　　　　SOURCE　　STATUS　　LEVEL

25.1	Expenditures/FTE employee, by function, on employee professional development.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
25.2	Gains/losses in course evaluation ratings attributable to turnover in faculty (comparisons of total first-time instructor ratings, term, and percents of highly rated first-timers retained into their second, third, etc. teaching terms, and course ratings of instructors not retained due to retirements, etc.).	MAF-HRS IDEA	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
25.3	Total release time/FTE employee (limited to faculty, administrators, and management staff) for re-training leaves, sabbaticals, and other extended professional development leaves. Add to this these date which describe aspects of employee commitment to OCC: retention of existing employees (turnover rates), and the influence of employee decisions to leave OCC (as opposed to retirements, etc.) on those retention rates.	MAF-HRS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
25.4	Numbers of support staff working day equivalents lost due to sickness.	MAF-HRS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
25.5	Percent of total support staff sick leave days which were lost on days adjoining weekends.	MAF-HRS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

26. *Index of Curricula Renewal* as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
26.1	Number of OCC courses and programs operated for the first time sometime in the past 12 months.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
26.2	Number of courses and programs canceled sometime in the past 12 months.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
26.3	Total of both of these as a percent of total OCC course offerings.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
26.4	Total number of library acquisitions/FTE student.	MAF-SIS	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
26.5	Total specific purpose revenues for curricula development projects.	MAF-CUFS	3	Col, Cmp, Org

27. *Index of Equipment Investment* (both operating capital and debenture capital) expressed
as a composite of:

		SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
27.1	Percent of total OCC student credit hours delivered via shops and laboratory student station.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.2	Total student credit hours delivered via scheduled time at laboratory/shop student stations.	MAF-SIS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.3	Total investments in equipment, inflation adjusted.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.4	Equipment investments as percent of total operating expenditures.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.5	Equipment investments per student credit hour (overall total).	MAF-CUFS-SIS	2, 2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.6	Equipment investments per laboratory/shop student station.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org
27.7	Equipment investments per student credit hour in laboratory student stations.	MAF-CUFS	2	Col, Cmp, Org

V. CONTINUAL MONITORING:

(Note: Possible indicators.)

	SOURCE	STATUS	LEVEL
A quarterly report to the OCC Board which summarizes each of the above indices in Institutional Effectiveness.	Board Minutes	2	Col
A quarterly report to the Chancellors's Council which includes the summary for the Board, and backs it with: the specific indicators used in constructing each of the indices; comparisons of the indices across functional and operating areas.	Chancellor's Council Minutes	2	Col
Routine production of program review versions of the Chancellors's Council report which display the same indices and specific indicators for individual programs, comparing to OCC averages... to connect the CSF's, and their indicators, to the program evaluation and planning processes now in place.	Held Meetings	2	Col, Cmp, Org
Annual production of budget preparatory materials which enable modelling of adjustments in operating budgets and their predicted impacts on trends in OCC's institutional effectiveness indicators... to connect the CSF's, and their indicators, to the budgeting processes now in place.	Memo to top Admin.	2	Col, Cmp, Org
Production, each term, of selected indicators needed to monitor, evaluate, and intercede in course schedules in ways which improve institutional effectiveness on scheduling-related factors...to connect appropriate CSF's, and their indicators, to the Dean's schedule planning processes now in place.	Memo to Deans	2	Col, Cmp, Org
Production, each term for each instructor, of selected indicators they need to monitor, evaluate, and intercede in their course contents and teaching methods in ways which improve the effectiveness of their courses...which would connect appropriate CSF's, and their indicators, to instructors' current efforts at planning their courses.	Memo to Faculty	2	Col, Cmp, Org
Annual production of institutional research reports which test and report the predictability of various outcomes (as a feeder to the budgetary modelling proposed above).	Report	2	Col, Cmp, Org

SOURCE

ADM:	Admissions Survey
BLS:	Bureau of Labor Statistics
BOC:	Bureau of Census
CSS:	Continuing Student Survey
CUFS:	Financial System on MAF
EMP:	Employer Survey/Focus Groups
FAS:	Financial Aid System
FTS:	First-Time Student Survey
GES:	Graduate Exit Survey
GFS:	Graduate Follow-Up Survey
HRS:	Human Resources System on MAF
IDEA:	Adjunct Faculty Evaluation
IPEDS:	Integrated Post-secondary Education Database System
ISS:	OCC Instructional Staff Survey
MACRAO:	Michigan Association of College Registrar's & Admissions Officers
MAF:	Mainframe Data
MDE:	Michigan Department of Education
MESC:	Michigan Employment Security Commission
NMS:	Non-Matriculating Student Survey
NRS:	Non-Returning Student Survey
PIS:	Peer Institution Study
POP:	Public Opinion Poll
SIS:	Student Information System on MAF
STF:	OCC Staff Survey
SWS:	Student Withdraw Survey (Form)
TRS:	Transfer Study

STATUS

1: Collecting and reporting in EMET.
2: Collecting, but not reporting in EMET.
2*: Data collection pending implementation of survey.
3: Not collecting.

LEVEL

Col: College
Cmp: Campus
Org: Organization (Cost Center)

NOTES

[1]Reporting at the Organization level is dependent upon the method used to collect data in the Continuing Student Survey (CSS). Sample size is of major importance in lieu of the need to have a sufficient number of cases to report at this level.
[2]If all applicants are "required" to report (declare) a program of study (discipline) then reporting at the DCl and Org level can take place. *Currently this data is suspect with regard to its accuracy.*
[3]Reporting at the Cmp, DCl, or Org level is dependent upon establishing a "name-linked" (SSN) Transfer Study (TRS). The GFS is only representative of graduates who transfer, while MACRAO is only at the institutional level within Michigan.
[4]Reporting at the DCl and Org level is dependent upon the ability of the Peer Institution Review (PIR) institutions providing data at the same level of detail.

```
┌─────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐
│ EMPLOYER INFORMATION│   │ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING│   │ PROFESSIONAL STAFF  │
│                     │   │ —DEMOGRAPHICS        │   │ RECOMMENDATIONS     │
│ —BPI RECOMMENDATIONS│   │ —EDUCATIONAL TRENDS  │   │ —FACULTY            │
│ —ADVISORY COMMITTEES│   │ —OCCUPATIONAL TRENDS │   │ —ADMINISTRATION     │
└─────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘
```

PROPOSAL/INITIAL ASSESSMENT
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REVIEW*,
LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN
SCHEDULE RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

→ RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
   DIRECTED BY ORIGINATOR
←

PRIORITY CHANCELLOR'S COUNCIL

APPROVAL   APPEAL

CURRICULUM PROCESS ←—— APPROVAL —— COLLEGE SENATE COUNCIL

ORIGINATOR and RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: DESIGN CURRICULUM
—PROGRAM FEASIBILITY & DEVELOPMENT STUDY
—STUDENT OUTCOMES, CONTENT
—INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN, STUDENT ASSESSMENT

VALIDATE CONTENT:

DEPARTMENT/ DISCIPLINE	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	ACADEMIC DEAN	COLLEGE COORDINATION by BALLOT(S)	ADVISORY COUNCIL if AAe

APPROVAL PROCESS

CAMPUS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
↓
YES
↓
CAMPUS PRESIDENT
↓
YES
↓
COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
↓
YES
↓
COLLEGE COUNCIL
↓
YES
↓
CHANCELLOR

*, Voting Members of the
Curriculum Committee:
   12 Faculty (3 per Campus)
   1 Vice Chancellor
   1 Registrar
   4 Deans (1 per Campus)

*₂ Standing Sub-Committee of
College Academic Senate:
   Same composition as above,
   but with different
   individuals serving.

IMPLEMENT
BUDGETING, STAFFING, SPACE ALLOCATION
FACULTY — DEANS — PRESIDENTS

EVALUATE

CURRICULUM EVALUATION COUNCIL *₂

PROGRESS REPORTS ONGOING (EACH 5 YEARS)
(PROGRAM REVIEW)—NEW (1st, 3rd, 5th YEAR)

→ DEPARTMENT/DISCIPLINE —
   RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
←

REVISE   CONTINUE   DELETE

COLLEGE COUNCIL

CHANCELLOR'S COUNCIL