

# Planning and Program Review Committee Request

Keith Wurtz and Jessica McCambly  
Planning and Program Review Committee Co-Chairs  
April 29, 2013

RE: Request for Planning and Program Cycle Change from a Three-Year to a **Four-Year Planning Cycle**

Crafton Council:

As part of continuous quality improvement, the Planning and Program Review Committee (PPRC) has been examining the workload of the PPRC and the length and effectiveness of the three-year planning cycle currently in place at Crafton. The Committee has engaged in numerous discussions about the three-year planning cycle (please see the following minutes: [April 1, 2103](#), [April 8, 2013](#), [April 15, 2013](#), and April 22, 2013). In addition, the Committee also collected information about the planning cycles from other community colleges (see 1213\_SummaryPPRCCycle.docx), and conducted a survey at Crafton (see 2013SP\_Cycle\_Survey\_Results.docx).

In brief, the most common planning cycle from the 18 community colleges that responded to a request for information on the Research & Planning Group listserv was a three-year planning cycle (39%). However, 56% of the colleges had a 4 or 6 year planning cycle. A common theme identified in the comments from other colleges was to be careful about extending the cycle because visiting teams are more likely to assume that program review is occurring for compliance purposes rather than for meaningful program improvement: "...the longer your cycle, the more likely a visiting team will call it into question."

The survey administered at Crafton received 55 responses. Fifty-six percent of the responses felt that the length of the three-year program review cycle is effective for program improvement. Of the 44% who felt that a three-year cycle was not effective, 38% felt a four-year cycle would be effective and 58% felt a five-year cycle would be effective.

Based on careful consideration of the above findings the PPRC would like to recommend that Crafton move from a three to a four-year planning cycle for the following reasons:

- A four-year plan would allow programs to think more strategically
- Four years will provide enough time to implement changes and gather and analyze data to measure progress
- The annual updates keep programs focused while allowing for modifications to the goals and objectives for continuous improvement
- Four years provides enough time to make changes, think globally, and assess where we are, where we want to be, and what it will take to get there
- All of the National and State certification programs are tied to a four-year review
- Moving from a three to a four-year cycle will reduce the workload for the committee and the campus

Sincerely,

Keith Wurtz and Jessica McCambly  
PPRC Co-Chairs