**Future Plans**

None

**List of Evidence**

Doc. 18     College Council Minutes, April 18
Doc. 19     College Council Minutes, September 5
Doc. 25     External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
Doc. 46     Participatory Governance Model, 2012-2015

---

**College Recommendation 2**                                        **Improving Institutional Effectiveness**

*To fully meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College further improve and integrate all of its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, identified goals, and a means to evaluate planning processes for effectiveness. (I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.f, II.B.3, III.A.6, IV.A.5, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.b)*

---

Recommendation 2 was referenced at three places in the External Evaluation Report. In Standard I.B, it was noted that while the College had made significant progress in increasing the effectiveness of its planning, further work was necessary **(doc. 25, pgs. 20-21).** At the time of the site visit, the College's annual integrated planning cycle had run one time and was still not fully integrated; different components of planning had independent timelines and triggers that appeared not to line up well. There were also some instances when plans were not completed as called for in the cycle, including the Strategic Plan. Formal evaluation processes remained to be put into place to ensure that the integrated planning efforts are fruitful and continue to be improved.

In Standard III.D, the team concluded that a weak link in the planning process was that assessment/ evaluation of the allocation of resources needs to be formalized and improvements from the assessment communicated to all constituent groups **(doc. 25, pg. 50).** In Standard IV.A, it was stated that a formal process of evaluation must be developed to assess the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making model **(doc. 25, pgs. 52, 54-55).**

**Progress in Addressing Recommendation**

*Standard I.B*

Further improvements have been made in the annual integrated planning cycle to increase the effective incorporation of documents and processes:

- The College completed drafting of its 2012-2015 Strategic Goals, which were approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2013; the new set of goals are more focused and in a much more measurable form than the prior set, each with an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators **(doc. 10)**.
- The College's Student Success Plan, which had been on an independent track since its creation in 2011 as a result of the dialogue surrounding the Student Success Task Force, has now been combined with the Student Equity Plan and is fully integrated into the annual process. In 2013, Cerro Coso Community College—together with Bakersfield College and Porterville College— joined the Achieving the Dream initiative, and a key element of the planning has been to establish the Student Success Plan centrally within the cycle as the culmination and focal point of the year's educational direction-setting **(doc. 5)**.
- The annual unit plan template was revised to identify strategies related to the Student Success Plan **(doc. 7).**
- The administrative service units of Maintenance and Operations, Information Technology, and Marketing have now been fully integrated as operational units within the planning cycle; in spring 2013, these units wrote administrative unit outcomes (AUO's); beginning fall 2013, they will write unit plans and be on the program review timeline for periodic evaluation **(doc, 6; doc. 48**).
- As detailed more fully below in Recommendation 5, the college human resources office is also being integrated as a full operational unit within the planning cycle, writing AUO's, an annual unit plan, and a program review.
- As detailed more fully below in Recommendation 3, the program review template was revised to better align the 6-year process with the annual planning cycle **(doc. 49).**
- As detailed more fully in Recommendation 3, the annual unit plan template was revised to more explicitly tighten the connection to program review, including annual updates on every unit's progress in achieving program review goals **(doc. 7)**.
- Mid-point progress reports for annual unit plans have been instituted to keep better track of goal completion **(doc. 5)**.

In addition, as both the Self Evaluation Report and the External Evaluation Report indicate, one of the College's self-identified action items to come out of the last Institutional Effectiveness Review was to develop a mechanism for more formally keeping track of institutional progress on strategic goals and objectives as well as enabling follow-up **(doc. 11)**. In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee created a crosswalk of goals to specific measures. Every goal now has an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators, ranging from specific data points already found within our MIS system, to periodic accountability reports, to specially created reports written for and maintained solely at the College. Moreover, a chart showing this crosswalk has been created and posted to the college planning website, including persons responsible and timelines for the data gathering **(doc. 61).**

*Standard III.D*

At the time of the writing of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the visit by the Evaluation Team, the newly adopted planning cycle was in the middle of its second run. Subsequent changes have been made that greatly enhance the tie between planning and resource allocation:

- In the 2012 planning cycle for academic year 2013-14, the annual unit plan template budget worksheet was redesigned so that resource requests were directly linked to second-level resource plans (staffing, professional development, facilities, information technology, and marketing); this made it vastly easier for the developers of these plans to identify and analyze requests.
- In preparation for the 2013 planning cycle for academic year 2014-15, the budget manager provided a spreadsheet for each unit pre-populated with line-item budgets, the current-year adopted budget, and 3-year actuals; this greatly simplified the unit's ability to plan and the budget committee's ability to pull together the requests for a first-draft budget **(doc. 56)**.
- The entire list of college budgets was charted out by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and each one incorporated into an annual plan at the unit, section, or division level; this means every org from which money is spent on resources is now integrated at some point in the annual planning cycle **(doc. 46, pgs. 31-33)**.
- The budgeting procedure as it exists in the current integrated planning cycle was formalized in an official Academic Senate-recommended budget process pursuant to AB 1725 **(doc. 46, appendix C**).

Further revisions are designed for the 2013-14 year. One greatly anticipated change, by faculty chairs and the budget committee alike, is the development of a web form that will simultaneously serve to capture the information in a database and automate the creation of the spreadsheets and budget committee reports. Another very important improvement planned for 2013-14 is the formation of an effective evaluation instrument for the budget process. In fall 2013, the budget committee will dialogue with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee about creating assessment measures, a timeline, and an official report-out mechanism. This instrument will specifically address the Evaluation Team's concern with formalizing an assessment regarding resource allocation and address the College's own self-identified action plan from the Self Evaluation Report **(doc. 12)**.

*Standard IV.A*

Progress has been made on evaluating planning processes for effectiveness.  In its Self Evaluation Report, the College identified two areas where it needed to implement a more formalized evaluation related to its planning and decision-making models. One was College Council **(doc. 14)**. In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee developed a rubric for assessing College Council through its representative function—how well it performs as a conduit of effective dialogue between stakeholder

groups and the president for informed decision making **(doc. 20)**. The rubric was distributed to College Council members at the final meeting of 2012-2013, a self-assessment completed, and the results shared at the first College Council meeting of 2013-14 **(doc. 21; doc. 19)**. A similar rubric to be distributed to stakeholders is in development for fall 2013. This is especially important for students since another of the self-identified action items from the last self evaluation was to develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of student representation on College Council and its sub-committees **(doc. 15)**. Another improvement is that a statement of College Council's periodic evaluation is now formally embedded in the Participatory Governance Model **(doc. 46, pg. 17)**.

The second area of planning and decision-making that the College determined needed a formalized evaluation is the work of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee itself **(doc. 16)**. In spring 2013, dialogue ensued about evaluating the Institutional Effectiveness Committee that resulted in a series of proposed changes to existing committees **(doc. 28)**. Since the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's charge is institutional planning, it was determined that it could and should work together with the SLO Committee and the (long defunct) Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee is to be resuscitated and broadened to include all college operational units, not just instructional. The SLO Committee, which is currently a sub-committee of Academic Senate, would be similarly broadened. This proposal was introduced to College Council in May 2013 **(doc. 19)**.

In terms of evaluation, these three committees would each provide guidance for improving the College's performance on the ACCJC institutional effectiveness rubrics: the SLO Committee for student learning outcomes, Program Review Committee for program review, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning. These rubrics would, in turn, be the measure of their effectiveness—the extent to which the college achieves and maintains Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement. As of the filing of this follow-up report, the proposal has been approved by College Council and is moving forward with implementation **(doc. 17)**.

**Conclusion**

The College has made considerable progress on this recommendation. In its External Evaluation Report, the team noted that the creation of the integrated planning cycle was the consequence of a rich culture of broad-based dialogue **(doc. 25, pg. 21).** The College continues to use this culture to improve the quality of its planning activities and evaluation processes. With the integration of the Student Success Plan into the annual planning cycle, every college planning document is now part of the cycle, completing the project begun two years ago to find a place for all plans in one yearly process.

What remains to be truly consolidated, however, is a comprehensive and integrated evaluation process. As indicated above, the College currently has assessment instruments for individual parts of its planning: an assessment matrix for strategic goals, standardized evaluation forms for professional development activities, a rubric to assess College Council and the Participatory Governance Model, the College Report Card, etc. But the pieces have not been brought together into one integrated system. In effect, the College is currently at the same place in its *assessment* of planning that it was in the planning process

itself two years ago: all the pieces more or less present but not pulled together systematically. The goal of doing so has already begun with an initiative by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to establish a more diversified set of data points that can be used for multiple planning purposes. This clarity of identification will sharpen the data points being selected while simultaneously making them more meaningful and enable more timely completion of plans. This is to be the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's major goal for 2013-14.

**Future Plans**

- *Goal*: Formulate an evaluation instrument for the budget process to measure the effectiveness of resource allocation. *Expected Completion Date*: March 30, 2014. *Position Responsible*: Director, Administrative Services (Budget Development Committee chair).
- *Goal*: Develop a comprehensive and integrated means for evaluating planning processes for effectiveness. *Expected Completion Date:* May 15, 2014. *Position Responsible:* Vice President, Academic Affairs (Institutional Effectiveness Committee chair)

**List of Evidence**

| | |
|---|---|
| Doc. 5 | Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Graphic and Timeline |
| Doc. 6 | Annual Integrated Planning Work Page, 2014-15 |
| Doc. 7 | Annual Unit Plan Template for Planning Year 2014-15 |
| Doc. 10 | Cerro Coso Community College 2012-2015 Strategic Goals |
| Doc. 11 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B.2 |
| Doc. 12 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B.4 |
| Doc. 14 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.A.1 |
| Doc. 15 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.A.2.a |
| Doc. 16 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.B.2.b |
| Doc. 17 | College Council Minutes and SLO/IEC/PR Proposal Materials, May 16, 2013 |
| Doc. 19 | College Council Minutes, September 5, 2013 |
| Doc. 20 | College Council Self Evaluation Instrument (Participatory Governance Effectiveness Rubric) |
| Doc. 21 | College Council Self Evaluation Results, 2013 |
| Doc. 25 | External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013 |
| Doc. 28 | Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, March 25, 2013 |
| Doc. 46 | Participatory Governance Model, 2012-2015 |
| Doc. 48 | Program Review Schedule |
| Doc. 49 | Program Review Template, 2013-14 |