

**Progress Report Due March 15, 2008**

**Recommendation 2: (Standards 3A.4, 3B.2, 3C.3)**

*The team recommends that the college strengthens the program review and unit-planning processes, emphasizing: Student Learning Outcomes, Systematic incorporation of research data, Alignment with college goals, Consistent reporting formats.*

*The team recommends the college take appropriate actions to assure the direct tie-in of program review to the budget and priority-setting process.*

**I. Introduction**

In response to recommendations from the Accreditation Commission, the Cuesta College has been diligent in refining its Instructional, Student Services and Administrative Services program planning processes and linking those processes to a comprehensive budgeting cycle. Specifically, the Planning and Budget Committee, with collaboration from the Academic Senate, the Shared Governance Council and managerial representatives from the Student Service and Administrative Units, have participated in collegial, self-reflective dialogue as to how to refine existing program plan and review processes while creating systematic feedback loops tying those processes to a complete budgeting cycle. Highlights from this dialogue include:

- Refinement of comprehensive program plan and review processes for Instructional, Student Services and Administrative Services Programs.
- Development and/or refinement and implementation of Annual Program Planning Worksheets for Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Service Programs. This includes a process for completing the budget allocation process cycle and including how allocations or lack therefore, impact programmatic success.
- Development and implementation of a Budget and Planning Calendar Cycle.

From 2005 -2007, the Program Review Planning Task Force (PRPTF) worked with the academic units to provide technical assistance and assurance that the program planning and review process was data driven and followed. Additionally, the Academic Deans and the Planning and Budget Committee, jointly worked with the non-academic units in the Program Plan and Review process, with the goal of consistency of process and templates, and the utilization of data as evidence for planning, across the college campus.

Additionally, these two groups also supported the non-academic unit and cluster planning processes. In spring 2008, the Planning and Budget Committee, revised both the unit and cluster planning processes to ensure consistency with Program Plan and Review across all facets of campus units, academic and non-academic. Additionally, reporting refinements to the Annual Program Planning Worksheet (as discussed in detail on pages 2-3) were implemented to close the loop between program planning, district allocation of monies and impact of distribution on programmatic success.

As revisions to the Program Plan and Review process were occurring, in the 2006-2007 academic year, the Planning and Budget Committee moved the program plan and review process to be completed during the Fall semester to ensure program recommendations and needs were then incorporated into the divisional unit, and subsequent cluster, budgetary plans.

## **II. Instructional Program Plan and Review**

The ongoing Instructional Program Planning and Review (PPR) process contains annual and comprehensive components (Two Year cycle for Career Technical Educational Programs and Five Year cycle for Transfer Programs) that involve an on-going systematic review of the relevance, appropriateness and achievement of stated learning outcomes. The revisions to this process occurred under the leadership of the Academic Senate and in response to the 2002 Self-Study and subsequent ACCJC response. In addition components of the PPR include documentation of currency and future course and program needs and plans. Program data, from Institutional Research, is used to assess program relevancy, currency and student achievement. For example, the annual plan includes commentary on the following requirements: program outcomes, anticipated scheduling changes, facility changes, assessment plans, program development/forecasting, staffing projections, budget, and other programmatic projections.

Additionally, the comprehensive review includes all the elements of the annual review, with the additional components of: history of the program; program goals; contributions and connections of program to the mission; values and the institutional outcomes of the college; a data analysis of relevant data including enrollment, retention, success, FTES/FTEF and degree and certificate completions. The narrative also sites the programs' intended student learning outcomes and identifies the connection to broad program goals; describes assessment of SLO's and recommends changes and updates.

Furthermore, the comprehensive review process includes a complete curriculum review including prerequisite/co requisite/advisory validations, identifying and revising appropriate Student Learning Outcomes for each course, describing the assessments of SLO's and describing the connection of Course SLO's to Program SLO's.

The annual and comprehensive review processes are key components that the college utilizes not only to assess learning outcomes and currency of programmatic offerings, but to ensure that program planning for future and continuing needs is clearly tied to the budget allocation process.

## **II. Student Services and Administrative Program Plan and Review**

Paralleling the Instructional Program Plan and Review, the Student Services and Administrative Services Program Plan and Review processes contain annual and comprehensive components in various stages of development and implementation. Both processes are data driven and involve an on-going systematic review of the relevance, appropriateness and achievement of stated outcomes. The master schedule of Program

Planning and Review for the college, including Student Services and Administrative Services, is maintained by the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning.

## **II. A. Student Services**

The Annual Program Planning Worksheet for Student Services is modeled after the instructional APPW format and includes commentary on the following requirements: department description (role within the college) stated program outcomes, methods of assessment, anticipated service changes/challenges, program development/forecasting, staffing projections and budget implications as well as the identification of priority request items funded and not funded on the last budget cycle.

Since the late 1980's or early 1990's, Student Services has been involved in designing and implementing program reviews. The review criteria established early on have, over the years, undergone revision and individual department interpretation. Most recently, Student Services has turned to the established instructional model as a guide, with modifications as deemed appropriate. Additionally, embedded into the comprehensive review process are components of categorical program reviews that some Student Service Programs need to complete for outside agencies. For example, CalWorks, Matriculation, EOPS and DSPS have all completed Chancellor's Office Student Service Program Reviews. These reviews are data driven and must support stated program and learning outcomes.

The next step in the development of the Student Services Comprehensive Program Plan and Review Process is to customize the existing instructional format to better suit Student Services, combining elements of the outside agency reports with current department planning and assessment, to create one consistently used comprehensive plan and review process.

## **II. B. Administrative Services**

In 2006-2007, the Administrative Services Units conducted their first ever comprehensive program reviews. The Comprehensive Program Plan and Review developed by Administrative Services is consistent with both the Student Services and Instructional processes. The elements include: department description (role within the college, current staff, productivity, current budget) an executive summary (customer relations, quality of service, department/ program outcomes and resources needed), self evaluation (staff, quality of service, institutional support, Accreditation recommendation) and department/ program forecasting (goals for improvement, trends and mission/ matrix educational facilities).

The Administrative Services Annual Program Plan and Review Worksheet has yet to be completed and implemented unilaterally at the unit level.

### **III. Budget Allocation Cycle Tied to Program Planning**

The budget allocation process begins at the instructional/ non-instructional unit level, via the unit plan. The unit planning templates utilize program plan and review justifications to create a context for allocation decisions. The unit plan is written within the scope of the College Goals and mission. Additionally, unit needs are identified as immediate, intermediate or long-term and categorized into personnel, instructional, non-instructional, operational and equipment, and are justified by the Program Plan and Review, Technology Plan, Educational and Facilities Master Plan and/or other college planning documents.

Based on either the Annual Program Planning Worksheet or the Comprehensive Program Review, the Unit-Plan covers the following elements:

- A listing of the programs / services covered by the unit plan.
- A listing of those participating in the unit planning process.
- Proposed measurable unit goals for the planning year that must support the Board approved goals and priorities for that year
- A restatement of the College Mission Statement and a listing of Board Approved Priorities and Goals are included.
- A listing, in priority order, of the following budget categories including the discipline, site, cost, new or replacement, and Justification (e.g. Program Plan and Review Data, the Technology Plan).

The first step in the unit process is to prioritize within each category. For example, all the personnel needs are prioritized against each other, then all the operational needs, etc., noting the site of each need.

The Unit Plan also includes a copy of each program's completed Annual Planning Worksheet. The Worksheet not only outlines the planning agenda for the program for the year based on its current Program Review but it also describes how the previous year's budget (both general fund and categorical funding) affected the progress of its planning agenda.

Unit plans are utilized by each cluster, and cluster administrator, as the foundation for the development of cluster plans. Cluster plans are presented at Planning and Budget, along with a Cluster Annual Program Planning Worksheet. The Cluster Annual Program Planning Worksheet is a compilation of all unit goals, driven by the college mission and Board Goals, and budgetary priorities as evidenced by college planning processes. Cluster plans are used to identify and prioritize college allocation expenditures.

Based on unit goals and priorities the Cluster Plans include:

- A listing of the programs / services covered by the Cluster Plan.

- Identification of Cluster prioritized goals for the planning year. The goals may be summaries of major Unit Plan goals as well as additional Cluster goals. The goals and priorities must be measurable and support the District's Goals and Priorities.
- An alignment with college goals is underscored with the College Mission Statement and a listing of Board Approved Priorities and Goals.
- A listing of the Cluster's overall immediate priorities by categories, including site.
- Also included in the Cluster Plan is the Overall Priorities of each unit for use in making spending decision by Cabinet and others such as the College's Foundation.

Additionally, each cluster administrator submits a Cluster Annual Planning Worksheet. This worksheet is a compilation of the units' Annual Planning Worksheets and provides a direct foundation for crating the College Plan publication.

All cluster plans are submitted to the Planning and Budget Committee and posted to the college website by the end of March. In April the Cluster leaders are each given an opportunity to make presentations to the Planning and Budget Committee to emphasis and clarify cluster needs.

Planning and Budget, after reviewing the written plans and the presentations, then makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees as to the planning and budget priorities for the upcoming planning year. The Board then reviews, edits, and approves the planning and budget priorities for the college for the planning year.

Based on the approved planning and budget priorities, Cabinet makes specific spending decisions for all categories except full-time faculty hiring. Spending decisions are then communicated from Cabinet back to the Planning and Budget Committee who then communicates decisions to the Clusters and the Units. An overall master list of stated unit needs is compiled for the College's Foundation.

Full-time faculty hiring decisions, a component of both the Program Plan and Review Process and the Unit Plan, are made by the Shared Governance Council. Shared Governance establishes prioritized fulltime faculty needs based on retirements, budget projects and planning needs.

Although the process needs further development, the established outcome for the Planning and Budget Committee starting in spring 2008 is to revisit prioritized needs from the current planning year in order to analyze:

- what needs have been met,
- what unmeet needs are still critical,
- what new needs have developed,

Draft #5 - Merzon  
02.25.08

- and how to proceed with spending for the balance of the year considering both general fund dollars and categorical funds in order to best meet prioritized planning and budget needs.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The college recognizes that refinement to tying the program plan and review process with budget allocation has been warranted. In response to this recognition, and as described above, Cuesta College has strengthened the program review and unit-planning processes, emphasizing Student learning Outcomes, utilizing a systematic incorporation of research data that aligns with college goals using consistent reporting formats. The college has taken appropriate actions to assure the direct tie-in of program review to the budget and priority-setting process. It will continue the on-going, meaningful dialogue that results in further refinements to these processes.

Therefore, Cuesta College does currently fully meet Recommendation 2 (Standards 3A.4, 3B.2, 3C.3) and the expressed concerns of the Commission in its letter of January 31, 2008.

#### **V. Evidence List**

- Unit Plan and Directions and Templates
- Cluster Plan and Directions and Templates
- Comprehensive Program Plan and Review Templates – Instructional, Student Services and Administrative Services
- Annual Program Planning Worksheet – Instructional, Student Service and Administrative Services
- Program Planning Task Force Guidelines
- Planning and Budget Committee 2007-2008 Cuesta College Planning Cycle
- Planning and Budget Committee Meeting Minutes – Fall 2006-Spring 2008
- Academic Senate Meeting Minutes – February 22, 2008



**Unit:**

**Cluster:**

**Planning Year:**

**Please complete the following:**

- X. **Program Outcomes**
- XI. **Assessment Plans**
- XII. **Program Development/ Forecasting**
- XIII. **Anticipated Scheduling Changes**
- XIV. **Facility Changes**
- XV. **Staffing Projections**
- XVI. **Overall Budgetary Issues**
- XVII. **Funded Requests Identify ALL unit priorities that were funded including the funding source (District, Categorical, Foundation). Describe how the resources positively impacted the program. Please include dollar amounts when possible.**
- XVIII. **Unfunded Requests Identify ALL unit priorities that were funded including the funding source (District, Categorical, Foundation). Describe how the resources negatively impacted the program. Please include dollar amounts when possible.**
- XIX. **Other Programmatic Projections/Issues**

***Additional Completion Information***

*Prompts VIII and IX are specific to requests made through the unit and process. These are meant to be macro-accounts of allocation requests and not meant to micromanage the process. Faculty should receive this information from their Dean and/ or the Planning and Budget Committee.*

*Please use the following numerical system when completing each prompt:*

- I. *Program Outcomes*
  - A.1. *First program outcome*
  - A.2. *Second Program Outcome*