

college community in a variety of formal and informal methods. The data supported discussion on strengths and weaknesses is used to set institutional priorities.

---

***I.B.9: The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.***

---

### **Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College employs a variety of plans as part of a comprehensive evaluation and planning effort. These plans work together to provide a complete picture of the short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services.

As noted above in [Standard I.B.7](#), one of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to further improve and integrate its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, and identified goals effectiveness. Before the 2013 Follow Up Report, the cycle, which had been implemented in 2011-2012, had been run another time and a number of changes were made to more strongly integrate the separate components of program review, planning, outcomes assessment, and resource allocation ([I.B.75](#)). Since then, the College has run the cycle on an annual basis and made several further improvements.

#### *Educational Master Plan*

Cerro Coso Community College adheres to Title 5 regulations in producing a comprehensive or master plan **once every five years**. The purpose of educational master plan is to identify long-range needs of the college and provide a context for decision-making regarding academic affairs, student services, and administrative services, with the outcomes of driving the planning of capital expenditures in the areas of facilities and establishing a vision and projections for more near-term institutional goal-setting. A central component of the plan is an external environmental scan that analyzes the service area's demographic trends, community profiles, and labor market trends. The most recent Educational Master Plan, linked from the [Planning Documents page](#), was completed in 2017 ([I.B.76](#)).

#### *Strategic Planning*

In this context set by the educational master plan, institutional goals are reviewed and revised **once every three years** through the strategic planning process. As described more fully in [Standard I.A.4](#) and evidenced in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook, strategic goals are reviewed and revised at the same time and on the same cycle as the institution's mission, vision, values, and institution-set standards ([I.B.77](#)).

The institutional priorities established in the strategic plan are integrated with and based on the mission and the context established by the educational master plan. Goal setting relies on data analysis from the mission review, performance on the institution-set standards, and successful

accomplishment of prior strategic goals as measured by a variety of student learning, student achievement, equity, and operational metrics. The last [Strategic Plan](#) was done in spring 2018 (**I.B.78**).

### *Program Reviews*

A second layer of assessment and planning at the College is carried out simultaneously at the department and unit levels. The most comprehensive of these is the program review, which is completed **once every five years**. Different from the institutional focus of the educational master plan and strategic plans, program reviews are focused on the long-term assessment and improvement of individual units and departments. At Cerro Coso Community College, program reviews are completed for all instructional degrees and certificates, all student services, and all administrative services operational units. Program reviews are also completed for information technology, marketing and public relations, and college human resources. The program review process is described much more at length in [Standard I.B.5](#).

### *Outcomes Assessment*

Also taking place at the individual department and unit level are the assessments of SLO's, PLO's and AUO's, which are on a set schedule of **up to five years**. All instructional and non-instructional units are expected to complete all outcomes assessments at least once every five years. Some departments do it sooner. The outcome assessment process is described much more at length in [Standard I.B.2](#).

### *Annual Planning Process*

The annual planning cycle takes place **every year** and is the shortest-term planning undertaken by the College. It leads directly to department, section, and division initiatives for improvement and, through the development of budget worksheets, to resource allocation. All integrated plans are linked from the [Integrated Planning page](#) and can be searched by year and by unit/department (**I.B.71**).

*Unit Plans, due October 15.* The cycle begins in the fall semester, as departments and operational units meet to plan for the next academic year (in fall 2018, for instance, planning is being done for academic year 2019-2020). Prior to the beginning of the semester, instructional units are supplied with [Program Review Data](#): student performance and equity data from the previous five years, thus showing current trends and gaps (**I.B.9**). (Confusingly, what is called "Program Review Data" at the KCCCD institutional research website is used primarily at Cerro Coso for integrated planning, not program review. It is generated every year, comes out in August, and plays a large role in annual unit planning. It might also be used by departments for their once-every-five-year review, but that is not its primary purpose at Cerro Coso. Nevertheless, "Program Review Data" is its label district-wide; being part of a district has its down-sides.) Departments and operational units use this student achievement information, as well as progress made on program review goals, outcomes assessment, equity gaps, and prior year initiatives, to identify gaps, dialogue about improvements, plan goals for the following academic year, and propose a budget.

The result, due by October 15<sup>th</sup> of every year, is the annual unit plan (AUP). The unit plan template requires the department or unit to review and address its connection to the college mission, its progress on equity gaps, its progress on program review goals, its progress on outcomes assessment, and its progress on prior-year initiatives. The completed document contains not only this gap analysis but also initiatives to be attempted for the following year and a comprehensive budget worksheet with requests for staffing, facilities, supplies, equipment, travel, and marketing based on the goals and plans for improved student learning **(I.B.79)**.

Every instructional department completes an AUP. The following non-instructional units also complete AUP's:

- ACCESS programs
- Admissions and Records
- Athletics
- Counseling
- Equity
- Financial Aid and Veterans' Affairs
- Honors
- Information Technology
- Maintenance and Operations
- Public Information/External Relations
- Student Activities
- Veteran's Affairs

Because of the variety of non-instructional units, the data used in the unit planning process for program evaluation mirrors those used by instructional units but varies with what is relevant to that program, such as usage and data statistics and any department data that is specific to its core function, such as percentage of students granted financial aid for the Financial Aid Department or number of student visits and contact hours in the Learning Assistance Center **(I.B.80)**. As with instructional departments, student services and administrative services units reflect on past performance, dialogue about their current status, and plan goals for the next academic year that address the college strategic goals and take into account any noteworthy budget forecasts **(I.B.81)**.

*Section and Division Plans, due November 15 and December 1.* During the next two months, wider circles of planning are accomplished. In the area of academic affairs, annual section plans (ASP's) are completed. These are plans for operational entities either comprised of groups of units working together (career and technical education, letters and sciences) or entire campus locations (Eastern Sierra College Center, CC Online, etc.).

The ASP's provide a functional review at the next level up. Deans and site directors review the AUP's of the units that comprise or affect their areas, dialogue with unit leaders as appropriate, winnow out untimely or unrealistic requests, and then write plans that capture goals the section can commit to for the following year. A key piece of this review involves resource allocation. Budget requests are scrutinized by the section leaders and steering groups, analyzed in context of the gaps and initiatives identified in the unit plans, and discussed with the unit proposer. The section leader completes a comprehensive budget worksheet, passing along resource

recommendations that he or she can support and declining to pass along recommendations that he or she cannot **(I.B.82)**.

After the ASP's are the annual division plans (ADP's), which are the final layer of review at the widest concentric circle. There are only four ADP's that comprise the College's functional divisions of instruction, administrative services, student services, and president's office. The chief officer of each division carries out this final review in the same manner as above: analyzing and synthesizing lower level plans, bringing forth needs in the five resource request areas, and completing final comprehensive budget worksheets of supported expenditures **(I.B.83)**.

*Resource Request Analyses, due February 15.* By December 1 every year, gaps have been identified in every unit, section, and division, goals set, and resources requested in the areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. At this point, 'second-level' plans are written that look at the resources across the college and aggregate them. These resource request analyses have no set template and are completed by the following responsible parties:

- Facilities: director of maintenance and operations
- Information Technology: director of information technology
- Marketing: manager of public relations and institutional advancement
- Professional Development: vice president of instruction and faculty flex coordinator
- Staffing: college president

The purpose of the resource request plans is to look at all the plans together college-wide and determine if trends, commonalities, and trade-offs exist and where efficiencies can be gained. The marketing and professional development plans also identify common threads that are established as priorities for the following year **(I.B.84)**.

*Budget, due May 1.* The last piece of the integrated cycle is the college budget, which is finalized beginning February 15<sup>th</sup>. Throughout the cycle, all units, sections, and divisions have completed budget worksheets, all budget requests have been reviewed and prioritized at each successive level of the cycle, and commonalities and trends in the resource areas have been analyzed. The Budget Development Committee reviews the revenue projections for the following year, determines the extent of all budget requests, and makes recommendations on specific line items. If needed, the Budget Development Committee will get additional information from or even meet with plan proposers. They will do this if there is a question about a line-item or there is a failure to come to agreement among unit, section, and/or division plans **(I.B.85)**. The result of this dialogue is a draft of the following year's tentative budget that is recommended to the president **(I.B.86)**.

As indicated above in Standard I.B.7, this integrated planning and resource allocation process is regularly evaluated as part of the overall assessment of the integrated planning cycle. For the purposes of this Standard, the biannual college Planning Survey asks respondents to rate their experience on such questions as, "My area's annual plan is integrated into the college's planning process," "Planning in my area is the result of collaboration and dialogue," and "There are clear connections at Cerro Coso between planning, budgeting, and the allocation of resources." Results in 2016 demonstrated a sizeable majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with these

statements, showing a modest increase on most questions from the prior survey in 2014 (**I.B.31, pgs. 2-4**).

Here are examples of improvements in the resource allocation process that have come out of these assessments since 2015:

- In 2015, the budget component of the integrated planning cycle was revised to remove redundancy: instead of proposers listing resource needs in tables in the plan and transferring those figures to a separate spreadsheet, the tables were eliminated and the spreadsheets enhanced to include justifications and drop down menu choices .
- In 2016, a ‘one-time’ code added into the budget worksheets to better distinguish program expenditures that are ongoing in nature—instructional supplies, non-instructional supplies, personnel, etc.—from special or unusual costs in any given year that ‘spike’ the budget. This was designed to help smooth out year-to-year budget analysis.
- In 2017, a rubric for prioritizing and analyzing budget requests was developed and piloted. It was first used by the committee in spring 2018 as a guide for discussions about particular line items.

### *Linkages*

Annual integrated planning is linked to program review through the explicit section in the template asking proposers to discuss “Progress Made on Program Review.” Proposers discuss work done on both 2-year and 5-year goals and are therefore kept responsible for making progress on quality improvements.

It is linked to outcomes assessment in the sections “Outcomes Assessment: Actions Taken” and “Outcomes Assessment: Gaps to be Addressed.” This ensures that program review goals as well as outcomes assessment results are kept continually in front of faculty and staff as they set yearly priorities and request resource allocations.

### **Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. Cerro Coso Community College has worked very hard over the last six years to design, implement, evaluate and improve a comprehensive planning cycle that is helps it accomplish its mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality. This institutional planning happens on a regular basis, includes wide participation across the college-wide community, uses valid data sources, and follows a consistent processes. Comprehensive planning addresses both short- and long-term needs of the institution.

### **Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process**

#### *Changes*

I.B.1: During this self-evaluation process, the College realized that while it has a structured dialogue on the components of this Standard, it was lacking a systematic approach to ensure that every group who needs to review certain reports or data sets is reviewing that information on a regular cycle. For this reason, in spring 2018 IEC began discussions about developing a chart of reports and data sets cross-referenced with the committees or work groups who review them and