

DRAFT – APRIL 22, 2010

Program Review and Institutional Planning/Resource Allocation Process

Using the Commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Mesa College has initiated many changes to its Planning and Program Review processes. The following information, also reported in Standard IIB, describes how the College has worked very diligently to reach the sustained continuous quality improvement level for these twin measures of institutional effectiveness.

The groundwork for an integrated planning process was described in the College's 2007 Mid Term Report. At that time, a strong Academic Program Review process was in place. Beginning fall, 2007, the College adopted an integrated approach to program review by blending the existing academic and student services models. A subcommittee of representatives from Student Services and the Academic Program Review Committee held several meetings during the summer 2007. During these meetings, the subcommittee defined the programs within Student Services and then placed them in the five-year cycle. Due to the projected site visit scheduled by the Systems Office, categorical programs were placed in Year One with the remaining service areas placed in Years Two to Five.

In the fall 2008, the College implemented its revised Program Review process that integrated Administrative Services into the existing blended model for academic programs and student service areas. A subcommittee of representatives from Administrative Services and the Program Review Committee was formed. Several meetings were held during the summer, 2008 where the subcommittee defined the various support units within Administrative Services and then discussed placement in the cycle. After discussion and review of a previous meeting with the Vice President of Administrative Services, it was decided that all support services would be placed in Year One of the cycle. The subcommittee also discussed how Administrative Services would be integrated into the response sheets for Year One through Five. After considering many labels, it was agreed that the terminology, "Service Area", currently used in the Program Review Handbook to designate Student Services would be expanded and include Administrative Services.

Upon review in spring of 2008, it was decided that an overarching strategic plan needed to be developed in order to provide the integration needed for the educational master plan. In fall, 2008, the Educational Master Planning Subcommittee was reformulated to become the new Strategic Planning Committee. This action ultimately led to the creation of a strategic plan, now in place, that reflects the comprehensive cyclical processes consistent with continuous quality improvement planning models. The conception of this plan began at the annual President's Cabinet Retreat in April, 2008, as they reviewed the Educational Master Plan and the rubric, and then progressed during the

school year. It became more fully articulated the following year at the next President's Cabinet Retreat, which was held in April, 2009. Much work has been done within this participatory governance process to refine the many practices and processes put in place with the earlier Educational Master Plan. The components of the strategic plan are consistent with those already in place; but an overarching structure now ties it all together and clearly links the cycle with measures of accountability and resource allocation. As the College developed its new mission, vision and values statements and the revised planning process evolved, its goals were revisited and revised to more accurately reflect the institution's direction and respond to and meet the needs of its internal and external communities. The new strategic planning process, including a distinct link to resource allocation was approved by the President's Cabinet in October, 2009. Following this approval, the College embarked upon a pilot program to test the new planning model.

Student learning outcome assessment is administered and tracked within the individual departments, programs, and service units, and their status is reported to the college through Program Review. In addition Program Review reports on the program's curriculum review cycle for instruction, and provides a detailed plan listing its goals, the resources necessary to reach those goals, the personnel responsible for each goal, and the timelines for achieving these goals. It also requires a detailed data analysis for institutional effectiveness in the year one report and a subsequent data analysis in year three. As part of continuous quality improvement, the Program Review Committee regularly evaluates and makes changes to its process and reports. The most recent revisions occurred during the summer of 2009 when a subcommittee studied the Program Review Handbook for Instructional Programs, Student and Administrative Services using a three-pronged goal of clarification, streamlining and maximizing the benefits to the participants and the College. As part of the review, *Outcomes-Based Academic and Co-Curricular Program Review* by Dr. Marilee Bresciani, a collection of good practices and principles, was consulted. The resulting changes included the systematic integration of data into the program plans and strengthening the pivotal role of program review in the College's planning process. Members of the Program Review Committee continue to offer lead writer training sessions to assist programs and service areas with the completion of their program planning documents. Clearly Program Review has become the locus for program planning, and it is based upon this level of planning that resources are ultimately allocated.

Program Review consists of a five year cycle that includes annual review and updates. In terms of communicating this information to the college, a one to two paragraph summary presenting an overview of the plan is now required for each Year One Program Review. These summaries become part of the Year One Report presented to the President's Cabinet during the spring semester. Program Review Reports are approved by President's Cabinet, and are made publicly available for review in the Learning Resource Center. The purpose of the

summaries is to provide a cogent at-a-glance overview that can be disseminated to the campus at large and to resource allocation committees. The power of the college's Program Review and its applicability to planning and resource allocation is seen in its level of integration. All three college divisions, including Instructional Programs, Student Services, and Administrative Services, are integrated into one process and fall under the guidance of a single Program Review Committee. As evidence of the committee's commitment to continuous quality improvement, recommendations for process improvements are included in its annual report, which is approved by President's Cabinet each spring. In reviewing Mesa's Program Review process with the commission's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness –Part I: Program Review, it clearly reaches the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level.

Currently under review, and tied in with the new, integrated strategic planning process, is the clear relationship of how the Program Review process informs resource allocation and links it to planning. The two processes are related, but the level of integration is a work in progress, and is being addressed within the strategic plan through the institution of a pilot project conducted during the fall 2009. With the assistance of President's Cabinet, the Strategic Planning Committee completed its work on the Mesa College Integrated Planning Framework. A crucial part of this planning process involves the Program Review cycle, specifically the allocation of resources. To test and inform the process, a pilot project was developed and conducted during the fall 2009 semester. To implement this pilot, a Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) was formed with representatives from the participatory governance bodies including the three Vice Presidents, six program review members (3 Academic, 2 Student Services, and 1 Administrative Services), and 1 student. A representative sample of programs and service areas from the 2008/2009 Program Review cycle were selected with the specifications that there be at least one from the arts, the sciences, career/technical and one service area. Appropriate documentation including past program review plans, data and other pertinent information were provided to the RAC membership and those participating in the pilot.

During the month of November, 2009, representatives from the selected programs and service areas presented their resource requests to the RAC. At the conclusion of the pilot, feedback from all participants concerning the process was collected and incorporated into a report to be presented to the President's Cabinet for review prior to distribution to the college for use and to inform the spring 2010 resource allocation process.

The college's Academic Affairs Committee will play a pivotal role in the development of this report using feedback from a meeting held December 8, 2009 for the specific purpose of eliciting comments and suggestions for improvement from those who participated in the RAC process. In addition, a survey was developed with the assistance of the Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research to collect data from the programs and

service areas that participated in the pilot. During the spring 2010 semester, these findings will be assessed and evaluated by the Academic Affairs Committee. In addition to the development of an educational component for the program review lead writers, the creation of a rubric and guidelines for the implementation of the resource allocation process is planned. The goal will be to meet the needs of the planning and resource allocation model without increasing the workload of those participating in it. Upon adoption of the revised model by the Presidents Cabinet and other participatory governance bodies, the next steps will be decided.

The planning and allocation of physical resources is overseen by the participatory governance Facilities Committee, which reviews the Facilities Master Plan and makes recommendations to the President's Cabinet. This committee is especially important in terms of the two construction bonds that were passed by the district and have direct implications for Mesa. Of note is the level of participation by the various schools in planning the structure and equipment for their new buildings. The new Allied Health Building is an example of how planning drives allocation. Because of the nature of this discipline, the faculty members were critical in designing the layout of their teaching spaces and the furnishings, fixtures, and equipment that went into them. The Math and Science Building is currently in the planning phase and has had extensive input and planning by the faculty who will teach there. They received a district grant to design a methodology for planning new buildings, and they later received funding to hire a consultant to help maximize teaching space according to square footage.

The planning and allocation of human resources is done through President's Cabinet, and the process for Faculty Hiring Priorities reveals a close relationship between planning informing allocation. The process involves an application that addresses ten principles of teaching and practice that are evaluated and ranked by a subcommittee of the Cabinet. In this way, the department puts forth its plan, as articulated against the hiring priorities, and the applications are placed in rank order of addressing these priorities. This rank ordered list is instrumental in the allocation of faculty positions. Currently, due to budget constraints, there is no new hiring, but the process remains in place for the time when funding returns. A similar process exists for the hiring of classified staff but through the Executive Staff. Like the allocation of other resources, both these processes use the Program Review plans as part of their decision-making.

Revised 04/27/10