

# Annual Evaluation of Planning 2011-2012

### Draft 8/22/2012 for Team B

Approved by Team B 9/28/2012

## Measures of Effectiveness – Completed by Research & Planning Based on Results of Plan Review

1. Percent of plan action items completed:

	Number of Action Items	Number of Action Items Completed by 2011-2012	Percent of Action Items Completed by 2011-2012
Educational Master Plan	180	6	3.3%
Other College Plans			

The original EMP had 233 action items, not including the four major goals or the "level 2" objectives. In its revision of the EMP in 2011-2012, Team A approved the deletion of 53 items because they were no longer relevant, leaving 180 action items in the revised plan. Team B determined that 6 of these items were completed.

## 2. Evaluation of Master Planning Process - Completed by Team B

2.1. Evaluate the extent to which the planning process meets the following criteria:

	0 (not at all)	1	2	3 (very well)
Master planning sets institutional goals				X
Master planning tracks progress toward meeting goals			Х	
Master planning offers input from appropriate constituencies				X
Master planning leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness			Х	
Master planning is supported by data and research				X
College plans other than the EMP have clearly assigned administrators and governance committees				Х
College plans other than the EMP are linked to college goals		Х		
EMP guides resource allocation		Х		

The ratings above are identical to the ratings in 2010-2011 with one exception: "Master planning tracks progress toward meeting goals" moved from a rating of 1 to a rating of 2. Improvement has been made in tracking progress on both Educational Master Plan (EMP) action items and the planning agenda items identified in the 2010 accreditation self study.

Work still needs to be done on tracking progress, on linking master planning with institutional effectiveness, with linking college plans to EMP goals, and with the linkage between the EMP goals and resource allocation. Progress has been made on all of these items. The linkage between college plans and EMP goals will be strengthened during 2012-2013 as the new "pyramid" model for master planning is implemented; the model requires items in college plans to be associated with EMP goals and the college mission statement. Additionally, the linkage between EMP goals and resource allocation exists through program review and resource requests, but work must be done to both strengthen the linkage and to document the relationship between funded resource requests and planning goals.

2.2. Team B narrative self-evaluation of the master planning process used in 2011-2012.

The planning process continues its integration with program review and resource allocation.

## **Accomplishments**

- Team B revised the Educational Master Plan, deleting items that are no longer relevant and rewording many items to make them clearer. The revisions were approved by Team A.
- Annual Goals were recommended and approved through the established governance system.
- 3. Administrative Regulation 3250 (Institutional Planning) was approved through the established governance system. The regulation requires that college plans be approved by the Campus Executive Committee.
- 4. The Institutional Planning Coordination Committee (IPCC) worked on strengthening the organization of college planning processes through a "pyramid" model clarifying the levels of specificity of college plans.
- 5. The IPCC revised its committee mission statement.
- 6. Core competencies have been added to the college mission statement drafted by Team B.

#### **Strengths**

- The college continues to use the integrated planning, program review, and resource allocation system. Evaluation is conducted annually and the results of the evaluation are used to improve the system.
- 2. The working relationship between Team A and Team B is clear and well defined.

#### Weaknesses

- 1. The EMP does not include timelines and measurable outcomes for each of its goals and action items.
- 2. EMP action items have not been prioritized.
- 3. Communicating and tracking information about progress toward EMP goals is still being strengthened.
- 4. Effective enrollment management, including an Enrollment Management Plan, still needs to be addressed.

#### Recommendations for 2012-2013 Cycle

- 1. Articulate timelines and measurable outcomes for the action items in the EMP and the implementation plans.
- Develop a process for prioritizing action items in the EMP and the implementation plans.
- 3. Continue the annual reporting of progress toward goals, including communication of the results and identification of examples of planning leading to institutional improvement.
- 4. Develop an Enrollment Management Plan based on the college mission and goals that guides scheduling.

## 3. Evaluation of Plan Review Process – Completed by IPCC

3.1. IPCC evaluates the Plan Review process used in 2010-2011.	

4. Overall Evaluation and Recommendations for Improvement – Completed by IPCC
4.1. Based on this evaluation, make recommendations for improving the planning process.