



# Annual Evaluation of Integrated Planning 2013-2014

## 1. Planning Processes

### 1.1. Percent of plan action items completed

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Educational Master Plan</b>			
Number of action items	192	192	192
Percent completed (or initiated, if ongoing)	3%	3%	59%

### 1.2. Evaluation of master planning process (completed by Team B)

Evaluate the extent to which the planning process meets the following criteria on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 3 (very well).

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Master planning sets institutional goals	3	3	3
Progress is tracked toward meeting goals	2	1	1
Master planning leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness	2	1	2
Master planning guides resource allocation	1	1	1

### 1.3. Strengths of the master planning process (completed by Team B)

- Creation of a system that includes maintaining, reviewing, and updating documents (particularly the Educational Master Plan)
- System for identifying weaknesses and means for improvement
- Participation of multiple committees and offices in developing and updating the master plan
- Availability of plan documents online

### 1.4. Weaknesses of the master planning process (completed by Team B)

- Organization among plans is still relatively weak
- Ability to collect current versions of college plans is still weak
- Elements of responsibility for activities in EMP are somewhat unclear (responsibilities are assigned but may not be well understood)

### 1.5. Accomplishments of the master planning process in 2013-2014 (completed by Team B)

- Creation of the pyramid diagram to organize the EMP goals and college plans

### 1.6. Recommendations for master planning in the next cycle (completed by Team B)

- Improve process for collecting college plans
- Expand responsible parties and communication about responsibilities defined in EMP

## 2. Program Review Process

### 2.1. Percent of programs completing program review in 2013-2014

	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Instructional Programs	94%	78%	
Student Services Programs	100%	100%	
Administrative Programs	71%	43%	

### 2.2. Evaluation of program review process (completed by Program Review Committee)

Evaluate the extent to which the program review process meets the following criteria on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 3 (very well).

	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Results of program review are used in decision-making	1.5		
Results of program review are linked to resource allocation	2	3	
Results of program review are used to improve programs	2	2	
Program review informs ongoing college planning	2	3	

### 2.3. Strengths of the program review process (completed by Program Review Committee)

- #1
- #2
- #3

### 2.4. Weaknesses of the program review process (completed by Program Review Committee)

- #1
- #2
- #3

### 2.5. Accomplishments of the program review in 2013-2014 (completed by Program Review Committee)

- #1
- #2
- #3

### 2.6. Recommendations for program review in the next cycle (completed by Program Review Committee)

- #1
- #2
- #3

### 3. Resource Allocation Process

#### 3.1. Percent of all validated and prioritized resource requests funded in 2013-2014

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Instructional Programs	29%	61%	56%
Student Services Programs	6%	11%	35%
Administrative Programs	9%	30%	56%

#### 3.2. Evaluation of resource allocation process (completed by Budget Committee)

Evaluate the extent to which the resource allocation process meets the following criteria on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 3 (very well).

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Funded resource requests are linked to college goals and plans	3	3	3
Funded resource requests are linked to program review	3	2	2
Funded resource requests are linked to student learning	3	1	2

#### 3.3. Strengths of the resource allocation process (completed by Budget Committee)

- #1 Use of alternative funds first in funding requests
- #2 Program Review documents are provided for reference
- #3 All constituent groups participate in process
- #4 All requests are linked to program reviews or plan reviews.
- #5 Historical data reflects an increased rate of funding requests
- #6 Process has been improved to take into account the priority from the standing committees in developing the consolidated prioritized list through a factor

#### 3.4. Weaknesses of the resource allocation process (completed by Budget Committee)

- #1 High cost items are not considered when there is limited funding
- #2 Expanded Budget Committee did not meet. Process handled by email only.
- #3 Some requests circumvent the process coming directly to the Budget Committee.
- #4 CHAC process needs to be more clearly defined with filling vacant positions
- #5 Insufficient funds to support requests

#### 3.5. Accomplishments of the resource allocation in 2013-2014 (completed by Budget Committee)

- #1 64 out of 117 requests were funded

#### 3.6. Recommendations for resource allocation in the next cycle (completed by Budget Committee)

- #1 Ongoing funding allocated to each division
- #2 Improve CHAC process for classified positions not included in Program Review
- #3 Hold Expanded Budget Committee meeting to gather feedback
- #4 Establish a level of funding for new budget requests

- #4 Establish a uniform process for resource requests that occur outside of the Program Review process.
- #5 Expand scope and develop a process for evaluating efficiency of long-term stipends and overtime pay

## 4. Summary

### 4.1. Summary of recommendations for future cycles:

- #1
- #2
- #3