Auburn Hills Campus Responses to the 1st Public Draft of the CAMP- by Jeff Farrah (AH campus chair)

Part I- Summaries and questions

The Auburn Hills campus responses to the CAMP draft includes various comments, and because the campus held two forums, a general discussion during our campus senate meeting, and I received numerous email responses, my approach was to try to capture the diversity of comments through a general executive summary (part I), and then different parts which correspond to either a forum, emailed responses, or other communications.

As a whole, the AH campus thought that in the 1st public draft of the CAMP document:

1) There was a general confusion between tactics, objectives, and strategies in the document overall. Because of this, many of the general comments indicated that the document did not answer or respond to a basic challenge of our institution: **How to motivate students to learn?**

2) The document failed to capture the intent of those who were at the various CAMP meetings (while also realizing the difficulties of trying to distill something from those forums), which the AH campus hopes is why each campus was asked to look at the document (to give feedback).

3) The CAMP document seems to understate the whole idea of student learning and student-centered approaches in general, so somewhere in the process this important theme was not captured in the draft as a whole. The best example of this would be objective 15 (college-wide faculty), which was seen as an objective that was antithetical to a student-centered focus and also a major priority of the college ("learning is our only priority")- assuming that learning implies focusing on students. The idea of developing stable and reliable relationships with students, from a teaching, librarian, or ASC perspective, was one way in which this objective seemed antithetical to a student-centered focus.   Because faculty are housed at a particular campus, this enables teachers to engage with students in the classroom, have office hours at one location where students can interact with instructors, and other campus-based processes that would be obstructed if moving to the idea of "college-wide faculty". There was also a general confusion over what that would actually mean and how it would affect our students in general.

4) The general consensus was that many of the objectives were already in process, the college had vehicles for achieving the stated objective, or that many of the objectives were things that a college must do as part of the general mission of the college. The question then became, if the objective is stated and it is already occurring, does this mean that we are not doing the activity well, or are folks not aware that a process is currently in place for the specific objective? Some examples would be Objective #1, where there is a process currently in place for embedding student learning outcomes, assessment and results into all disciplines for continuous improvement, improving the ways and means by which students are evaluated, and using the results to improve learning. The idea (for this particular objective) was that teaching faculty actually do this and are generally always exploring ways to evaluate students effectively and improve learning (especially through the use of assessment tools).   Another example would be objective #6, where the curriculum committee is currently in the process of updating the curriculum handbook. Finally, Objective #14 seems to assume that currently OCC does not have a

student friendly flexible schedule for the academic year (some asked where the evidence for this claim came from), but literally all at the various forums thought that was an existent strength of OCC. Students have opportunities to take classes across the four campuses at multiple times and days and the process is working very well, especially when the institution experienced high enrollment numbers such as last year.

5) There was some commentary that a modern 21st century educational institution such as OCC must by default embrace concepts such as global learning and education so as to remain competitive in an increasingly globalizing world. While there was acknowledgement that OCC has developed a Global Studies degree, has a long tradition of working with study abroad and faculty and student exchanges via the OCC-Oaxaca cyber-community initiative and recent efforts to establish learning communities in India, many felt that the document did not recognize the importance of global learning and education in general as a key priority of the college.

6) In the area of priorities, there was a general consensus that OCC must implement Objective #5 and choose which pathway the institution will be using, but also there were concerns expressed over how the institution measures success (completion or graduation). The basic sentiment was that there are many ways to measure success, and that we need to fully engage this discussion and expand the way a community college defines success in general (for example, are students transferring to a four year institution, and are they doing well in this endeavor?).

Part II

The following represents comments that were raised at one of the forums, and this includes questions, edits, and other areas such as where clarification might be helpful for the CAMP and future iterations of the CAMP:

Notes for College-Wide Academic Master Plan 2012-17 Discussion

Meeting held April 19, 2012

Present:

Bob Andersen	Jen Liang	Michelle Samtouni
Ted Bolak	Verna Love	Suba Subbarao
Mivida Burrus	Pat Nowaczynski	Henry Tanaka
Michelle Casanova	Carlos Olivarez	Kathy Tiell
Marikay Clancy	Anne Palmer	Dawn Young
Jennifer Craft	Alicia Paramo-Dionne	

The group started the meeting by stating that they hope that all of the elements of discussion from the two previously-held college-wide CAMP meetings will be included in the final document. They are not included in the document/plan reviewed today. With this document, there needs to be/show consistency of objectives in format (specificity and measurable).

On the Process page, there is mention of gathering of data over the summer (second to last paragraph). There was concern that some full-time faculty are not here in the summer, and that would limit the opportunity to participate.

Strategic Outcome #1
Objective 1 B.: This is not measurable—it needs to be rephrased and more specific. Course outcomes need to be consistent college-wide.

Objective 2: Add certificates as well.
Objective 2 A.: change word "graduation" to "success"

Objective 3: add word "courses" after "programs" (to read, programs and courses). Clarify "learning" modalities—it should state "teaching" modalities instead.

Objective 5: Statement is unclear. Word "review" of HLC's new pathway should state "align with" instead.

Objective 6: Statement to wordy, simply state, "Develop curriculum process in totality."

Objective 7: "each service and academic program" is too unclear a statement—specify.

Strategic Outcome #2
Objective 8: K-12 and universities and colleges should be two different categories. Separate out global studies. Add word "existing" after "Establish and strengthen" (to read, establish and strengthen existing . . .).

***Overall statement: Use consistent language that matches OCC language.
***Overall statement: Objective should be a singular focus.

Objective 9: Orientation should be explored and implemented based on current initiatives in place—with multiple modalities (some more tech involved and some not).

Objective 10: Where did the KPI's go? Over-reaching statement (i.e., these data sets would establish the viability of existing courses)—data alone shouldn't be all values. Define "data" in data sets.

Objective 11: Clarify statement—too general – mixed messages.

Objective 12: Clarify audience and separate new faculty from current faculty professional development.
Objective 12 B.: Clarify statement—is "new" referring to new faculty members or is there a new academy for all faculty?

Objective 13: Add "if necessary" after the word "expand" (to read, expand if necessary). Statement too evasive-improve it. Address tech inequities—some students cannot even afford a computer, let alone have ready use of one.

***Overall statement: Include a variety of different students to review this plan.

Objective 14: Year-round registration should be provided. Summer schedule should be separated, by color, Summer I and II—different color pages for each session.

Strategic Outcome #3
Objective 15: Clarify "college-wide faculty"
Objective 15 A.: Should be a separate objective and address multi-discipline barriers.

Objective 16: Change word "identify" to "emphasize" and try to get as many as possible to be on board.

Objective 19: Emphasize the need for consistent, college-wide communication about non-course offerings.

Strategic Outcome #4
Objective 20: Establish a Service Learning program first before we have an office for it. Take Service Learning and Honors College out of this objective—they are not external.

Objective 22: Direction of Foundation is unclear.

Objective 23: Needs clarity—is more than one objective. Create a data base of the "human" resources within the community and alumni.

Objective 24: Too generic. Add, "Expand our global-learning initiatives."

Strategic Outcome #5
Objective 25: Isn't this already someone's job? Keep decentralized. Objective needs to be clarified and more specific.

Objective 26: Clarify—is this CETF role? Define inventory.

Objective 27: Internal and External.

Objective 28: There are several objectives rolled into one for this objective. There were several Enrollment Management task forces that submitted plans in the recent past—what happened with those suggestions/recommendations?

Objective 29 B.: Regarding "create a First Year Experience," CNS-1100 (Orientation to College) already exists—this is a duplicate.
Objective 29 C.: How does creating this (Developmental Ed. Dept.) optimize success?

Part IIIa:

Some priorities and other questions and concerns raised via some emailed responses:

1. The objectives are generally the right size and scope, and are clear enough to create a cogent string of outcomes. The only objective I would suggest needs serious review is Objective 15, "Move to college-wide faculty to address the student needs and demands." As currently phrased, this objective suggests a change in the teaching assignments for faculty, while the first sub point discusses breaking down barriers that prevent faculty from thinking about the interests of students from a college-wide

perspective. The inconsistency is glaring-- are we seeking to embrace a college-wide thought process, or are we seeking to create a pool of itinerate faculty members who have to teach at all campuses, threatening to weaken the sense of community that is essential to each campus?

2. The scope of the objectives seems continuous and clear.

3. For 2012-13, focus on objectives 7, 12, 13, 14, and 17. They all flow logically from the current priorities, and would be able to be implemented with relative ease, allowing discussions to begin on more ambitious objectives.

Part IIIb:

Everywhere the term "quality" is used in the draft of the CAMP, add the modifier "high".

Listed below each of the five **strategic outcomes** are my rankings for the currently proposed objectives. Please note, in addition to ranking the objectives, I have made some additions and/or comments next to some of them.

Strategic Outcome #1
First→_Objective 5:_ academic rigor should be defined at the **course** level, by each discipline, as well as at the program level
Objective 7: add to item "A"…."learning tools, in all classrooms and laboratories".
Objective 2: In item "A", after the word benchmarks, add "and employment ready skills"
Objective 6: after the word program, add "or course".
Objective 4

I do not like either Objective #1 or #3 as written. Please see below.
Objective 1_: Embed Student Learning Outcomes, Assesment and Results into all service centers and disciplines for continuous ~~improvement~~_ **review to identify areas where improvement is needed.**
      _A._ This is OK as is.
      _B._ Use the results to improve ~~learning~~ **evaluation and teaching methods with a goal of improving learning.**
Objective 3_: Expand the offering of **courses and** programs through a variety of learning modalities to accommodate students' learning styles, **transfer readiness and/or employment skills.**_

Strategic Outcome #2
First→_Objective 10_
Objective 9
Objective 12
Objective 13: after "technology tools" add **equipment and facilities.**
Objective 8
Objective 11: In item "B", after "completion/goal attainment" add **development of career-related skills**

Objective 14: academic

Strategic Outcome #3
First→*Objective 17*
        Objective 18
        Objective 19
        Objective 16
OMIT Objective 15

Strategic Outcome #4
First→*Objective 20*
        Objective 21: **roll all of existing objectives 22 and 23 into this objective**
        Objective 24

Strategic Outcome #5
First→*Objective 29*
        Objective 28
        Objective 26: add the following as an item "C", **C. Update and upgrade existing science labs where needed for safety as well as to accommodate the use of modern, technologically advanced, instruments and scientific laboratory protocols.**
        Objective 25
        Objective 27

Part IV

The following document below was prepared to respond to how to motivate students, and is included to provide an actual implementation strategy:

REQUEST for Highly Effective Use of Resources and Staff Request

Provide new programs for students in the Achieve the Dream Program. This program will support the Achieve the Dream program by Building Recreational Activities through Venues of Education and will be called: DREAM BRAVE

<u>Goal:</u> to improve academic performance of all students in the program, to improve student leadership skills and to improve student awareness and desire to improve local, national and global areas of need.

We will require space, minimal support staff/funding**. (see below for support suggestions)**

<u>KEY TO PROGRAM SUCCESS:</u>

The key is to start where the student are "emotionally". Understanding that some students don't care what you know until they know that you care reaches students emotionally first by providing programs of interest. Relationships are created and new models/visions began to develop for each student that becomes the emotional ignition needed to withstand the failures preceding desired success.

Without strong motivation students often give up before they can experience some positive results.

Provide Basic Student Leadership Skills in exchange for participation in other programs

- A.) Intramurals
- B.) "Extramurals"
- C.) Job Shadowing
- D.) Partnering in Community Learning

Proposal: Run Pilot program that utilizes the empty K building area. This program would be funded & staffed from H building open gym fee's and H building staff.

- Success measurement baselines and timelines can be established by a small committee
- A one year pilot program is requested

DRAFT Presented by: Steve Ogg 4-16-12