

**Planning and Program Review Cycle and Recommended Changes**

**ACCJC Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions review:**

**Standard 1B.5**

The college has established and used program review processes that incorporate systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs and services using data on student learning and student achievement.

**Standard 1B.7**

The institution regularly reviews and assesses its institutional effectiveness practices and processes, including its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, and re-evaluation, to determine their efficacy.

**Standard 1B.9**

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.

**ACCJC Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation review:**

**iii. Evidence of Quality Program Review**

- Program review cycles/timelines
- Policies on curricular review
- Evidence that SLO assessment data are used for institutional self-evaluation, planning, and improvement of teaching and learning
- Action taken (improvements) on the basis of program review
- Connection to the budgeting and resource allocation processes
- Impact on institutional effectiveness, educational quality, and student success

**Current Cycle:**

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<p align="center"><b>Program Review</b></p> <p>-Effectiveness Measures -PLO Progress -Vision/Mission Alignment -Four-Year Action Plan</p>	<p align="center"><b>Annual Plan</b></p> <p>-SLO Progress -Status of Goals/Objectives -4-Year Action Plan Update</p>	<p align="center"><b>Annual Plan</b></p> <p>-SLO Progress -Status of Goals/Objectives -4-Year Action Plan Update</p>	<p align="center"><b>Annual Plan</b></p> <p>-SLO Progress -Status of Goals/Objectives -4-Year Action Plan Update</p>

## Recommended Changes to Planning and Program Review Cycle

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Program Review</b> -Effectiveness Measures -PLO Progress -Vision/Mission Alignment -Four-Year Action Plan		<b>Two-year Update</b> -SLO Progress -Status of Goals/Objectives -Action Plan Update	

**Rationale for change:** The current cycle does not provide sufficient time for programs to plan, implement, and assess modifications to programs. Some changes also rely on additional funds that do not become available to units in the year in which they were requested. Additionally, the committee does not review annual plans and are not able to provide feedback to these plans until the next Program Review.

### Policies of the recommended plan

- Units will continue to provide SLO updates annually through the SLO cloud. These updates can be further analyzed in the Two-Year update.
- Units that are categorized as a “needs improvement” unit will be required to complete an update every year until they have been removed from this status.
- Units who wish to update their plan during “off” years due to changes in direction or funding are free to do so, however, any such updates will not change the established cycle that the unit has been assigned.

### Changes to the Planning and Program Review Committee

- The committee will continue to review 4-yr plans and provide written feedback. In addition, the committee will review the 2-yr plans and provide written feedback with no required meeting.

### Justification and Goals of Recommended Changes

Changes to this cycle will provide units with the opportunity to focus on change and improvement during off years. Reviewing the two-year plans, in addition to the four-year plans, will allow the committee to advocate for its units more effectively during the roll-up process because it has provided the committee with a more intimate knowledge of units and their needs. The goal for the review of the two-year plans is that it will provide additional support for units and its designated managers through the feedback process that will now occur biannually rather than every four years. This justification is supported through ACCJC standard 1B evaluation criteria which states that “These processes support programmatic improvement, implementation of modifications, and evaluation of the changes for continuous quality improvement”.