

Crafton Hills College
Planning and Program Review Committee

Integrated Planning and Program Review
Handbook

Second Edition

Approved August 6, 2010

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction.....	3
Purposes, Scope, and Structure of Integrated Planning and Program Review	4
Overview of the Integrated Planning and Program Review Cycle	6
Participation in Integrated Planning and Program Review	7
General Suggestions for a Successful Process.....	8
Preparing for the Process	9
Completing the Forms.....	12
Program Review Form Questions	12
<i>Three-Year Action Plan</i> Questions	16
Annual Planning Form Questions	19
Initial Feedback and Submissions.....	21
<i>Required Formats for Submissions</i>	21
<i>Instructional Disciplines</i>	21
<i>Learning and Instructional Resources</i>	22
<i>Student Services</i>	22
<i>Administrative Services</i>	23
<i>President’s Area</i>	24
<i>Technology Resource Requests</i>	24
<i>Submission Checklist</i>	25
Evaluation Process for Program Review	26
Evaluation Process for Annual Planning	28
Institutional Priorities Process	29
Evaluation and Improvement of the Planning and Program Review Process	30
Accreditation Standards	31
Glossary	32
Appendix.....	33

Introduction

This Handbook has several purposes:

- Describes the purposes, scope, and structure of the integrated planning and program review process.
- Suggests thoughtful preparations for the process.
- Provides instructions for preparing and submitting the program review and annual planning forms.
- Explains the evaluation processes for both program review and annual planning.
- Describes the institutional priorities process that relies on the program review and annual planning documents.
- Describes the evaluation of the integrated planning and program review process itself.

The Handbook will be reviewed annually by the Planning and Program Review Committee, and will change over time, partially in response to users' requests for clarification and enhancement.

For definitions of terms used in this Handbook, please refer to the Glossary.

This Handbook, the planning and program review schedule, and most of the forms, references, and rubrics used in the process, will be posted in the documents area of the Planning and Program Review Blackboard Community website (blackboard.sbccd.cc.ca.us) and may also be downloaded from the Planning and Program Review Committee website:

http://www.craftonhills.edu/Faculty_&_Staff/Committees/Planning_&_Program_Review/index.php

Purposes, Scope, and Structure of Integrated Planning and Program Review

Purposes

The fundamental purpose of ongoing, integrated planning and program review is to maintain and if possible improve the effectiveness of every College program and service, and of the institution as a whole, based on the results of regular, systematic assessment. The ultimate beneficiaries of integrated planning and program review are our students and the community we serve.

A secondary purpose of the process is to focus available resources—staff time, budget, technology, space—on the achievement of goals and objectives intended to maintain or improve effectiveness. Achieving some objectives requires resources over and above what is available, which means that a resource request is necessary. But achieving others requires no extra resources—only the reallocation of existing ones.

Scope

The planning and program review process applies to every unit in the College. That includes all units in Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's Area.

Structure

The Planning and Program Review Committee (P&PRC) coordinates the planning and program review process from start to finish every year. The P&PRC:

- Provides documentation and training on the process.
- Establishes the schedule.
- Reviews submitted documents and provides structured feedback on them.
- Reports to the College President on the health or effectiveness of all units that complete program review; notes any that are exemplary as well as any that are in distress and require assistance from senior management to improve.
- Makes recommendations to the College President on College-wide resource priorities.
- Evaluates annually the forms and rubrics used in the process, all documentation (including this Handbook), and implementation of the process itself, and makes recommendations for continual improvement.

The Committee is co-chaired by the Vice President of the Academic Senate and one of the three College Vice Presidents. Its membership includes representatives of faculty, classified staff, management, and students. The Office of Research and Planning maintains the Committee archives.

Central to the whole process, of course, are the units themselves, who devote much time and energy to evaluating their own performance, identifying needed improvements, setting goals and objectives accordingly, and implementing those improvements in a continuous cycle.


The unit leader is charged with ensuring that the unit's integrated planning or program review process is completed properly and in timely fashion.

- For most programs within Instruction, faculty chairs, coordinators, directors, and deans, as applicable, are the unit leaders.

- For an instructional program with no full-time faculty, the unit leader is the applicable dean or designee.
- For interdisciplinary studies, the unit leaders are the deans and faculty chairs collaboratively. (As courses are added, the appropriate deans and faculty chairs are included in the process.)
- For each program within Student Services, the unit leader is the dean or director.
- For each program within Administrative Services, the unit leader is the supervisor (working collaboratively with leads to the extent feasible).
- For those units reporting directly to the President, the unit leaders are the directors.
- For the Office of the President itself, the President is the unit leader, and is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit program review documents to the P&PRC.
- If the normal unit leader for a given program is not available, then the unit leader's responsibility becomes that of the normal unit leader's supervisor. For example, if a directorship is vacant, then the unit leader is the dean or Vice President to whom that director reports.

Overview of the Integrated Planning and Program Review Cycle

The planning and program review process is a three-year cycle, as shown in the diagram below:



Each unit performs a full program review every third year. The less detailed annual planning process serves to update the program review. Every unit prepares a *Three-Year Action Plan*—with goals, objectives, actions, and (where appropriate) resource requests—every year.

Each unit implements any necessary improvements that it has identified, then assesses its progress, and the cycle continues. See the *Completing the Forms* section below for detailed information on all the contents of the documents prepared for both program review and annual planning.

Participation in Integrated Planning and Program Review

Broad participation in integrated planning and program review, as with any shared-governance activity, is an important contributor to the effectiveness of the process. So the unit leader should invite all members of the unit, including managers and full- and part-time faculty and staff, to participate in the preparation and/or review of each program review and planning document.

In addition, at least one representative of each primary clientele of the unit should be invited to participate in the preparation and/or review of each program review and planning document. Programs offering instruction or services to students should always invite at least one student to serve as a participant or reviewer. Programs offering services to faculty, managers, and/or classified staff (e.g., Admissions and Records, Bookstore) should always invite at least one of these clients to serve as a participant or reviewer. Additional participants (e.g., community members, business representatives) may be added at the unit's discretion. Finally, at least one outside person—ordinarily an employee of the District in another department, but sometimes a community member or other appropriate non-District employee—should be invited to review each program review document.

Documentation

On the *Participation in Annual Planning or Program Review* form (available on the P&PRC website), each unit documents:

- The names and positions of all unit members and others invited to participate in the process
- Whether or not each ultimately participated
- If he or she did participate, whether as a full participant or as a reviewer

P&PRC provides each unit with a *Program Review/Annual Plan Signature Sheet*. At a minimum, all permanent employees in the unit, and as many as possible of the rest of the unit's members, should sign that sheet. They may indicate either that they share in a consensus about the contents of the applicable document, or that they do not for the reason they indicate. Note that consensus does not necessarily mean agreement with every detail, but rather willingness to accept the contents as a whole for the good of the unit.

General Suggestions for a Successful Process

1. Document in summary form:
 - a. Participation in and results of all meetings and discussions
 - b. Reviewers' comments
 - c. Dean/director/supervisor feedback
2. Start early, and set aside ample time to discuss the issues related to planning and program review, and to draft, review, and revise your answers to the questions. The difference between an outstanding program review or plan and a poorly written one often boils down to the amount of time devoted to the process. On the other hand, it is counterproductive to spend excessive time on the process. Try to strike a reasonable balance.
3. Length of Responses
 - a. Please answer all questions thoughtfully, fully, and accurately, but be as concise as you can.
 - b. Based on P&PRC experience in previous cycles, a high-quality set of responses to the program review form questions is likely to require about 10 pages of text (assuming single-spaced in 12-point type, not counting pictures, charts, tables, the *Three-Year Action Plan*, and any attachments or appendixes) at minimum, and is very unlikely to require more than 15 or 20. Responses to the annual planning questions should be considerably shorter overall.
4. If you are stuck at any point in the process, contact a Planning and Program Review Committee member and ask for help. See the committee website for contact information.
5. Please define any acronyms you use in your documents, so the committee can understand your meaning.

Preparing for the Process

Properly done, planning and program review require thoughtful, thorough consideration of all aspects of your program. Beginning several months before the program review or annual planning deadline, and ideally on a continuing basis, your unit should engage in a series of discussions related to the questions you will be answering (which are shown in the applicable *Completing the Forms* section below), and prepare a summary of the results of each discussion. Below are some ideas on the topics that those preparatory discussions might involve.

All College Areas

Discussion Categories	Specific Topics
SLO/SAO Cycle and Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current progress in the cycle • Observations, interpretations, and lessons from the assessment • Areas that are going well based on assessment • Areas that are not going well based on assessment • Plan for improvement: Maintaining strengths and mitigating problem areas • Plan for subsequent reassessment
Representativeness of Population Served	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics of population served compared to College-wide and service area • Participation in outreach and/or marketing activities to reach targeted students, businesses, community members, etc. • Unit plans to improve representativeness with outreach and/or marketing activities
Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both internal and external partnerships—with whom do you work inside the College and/or with whom do you work outside the College? • How these partnerships contribute, or fail to contribute, to effectiveness and success • New partnerships that need to be developed
Best Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of best practices in the unit and how those are contributing to effectiveness and student success • Customer service status and improvements
Efficiency in Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of streamlining processes to reduce time spent or resources used • Reducing duplication of effort • Cross-training to minimize disruption of service due to absences or departures
Efficiency in Resource Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How existing resources are being used more efficiently (e.g., supplies going further by changes in operations) • The impact of fewer resources and how that is being addressed
Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of professional development on staff competencies/talents • Distribution of workload • Trends and patterns in full-time/part-time faculty ratio, WSCH per FTEF, fill rate
Shared Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which unit members participate in shared-governance activities and committees • Satisfaction with participation in planning and decision-making
Group Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of teamwork, communication, decision-making, etc., that are contributing to effectiveness and success • Examples of dysfunction that are negatively affecting results, morale, etc.
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Processes, practices, and/or products that have been introduced in the unit since the last program review to improve functions or services
Compliance with Mandates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature and extent of mandates that apply to the unit (laws, regulations, policies, standards, and other requirements) • Trends or variations in the number or complexity of mandates
External Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgetary and other constraints and opportunities • Impact of economic swings, the job market, competition from other programs • Developments in the field

By College Area

Discussion Categories	Specific Topics: Instruction	Specific Topics: Student Services	Specific Topics: Administrative Services and President's Area
Student Performance and the College Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student retention, success, persistence, licensure pass rates, employment rates, performance after transfer, awards, etc. • How and why these measures reflect on the unit's effectiveness in positive or negative ways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student retention, success, program completion, persistence, employment rates, special awards, etc. • How and why these measures reflect on the unit's effectiveness in positive or negative ways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely availability of textbooks • Access to food services • Student opinions of classroom condition, campus safety, etc.
Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions made about curriculum and rationale for those decisions • New courses or programs and why they were added • Courses or programs that were deleted and why • Status of courses due for revision • Involvement in Learning Communities and other alternative learning strategies, with possible implications • Relationship to other courses and programs • Student preparation, remediation, placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions made about curriculum and rationale for those decisions • New programs or courses and why they were added • Programs or courses that were deleted and why • Involvement in Learning Communities and other alternative learning strategies, with possible implications • Relationship to other departments • Involvement in placement, remediation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities modifications to accommodate curricular and pedagogical changes • Number and nature of service failures (e.g., network connectivity, electrical outages) that require cancellation of classes
Scheduling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit's scheduling matrix—plans for course offerings over a three-year period with appropriate rationale • Any cancelled courses, along with reasons and solutions for future offerings • Trends in evening, weekend offerings • Trends in online offerings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in evening, weekend services • Trends in online services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of services to avoid unnecessary conflicts • Scheduling of use of study rooms, conference rooms, and other facilities
Alternative Modes of Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student performance results in courses offered online or as hybrids, compared to traditional modes of delivery • Plans for future alternative course modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes of and student satisfaction with alternative service modes • Plans for future alternative service modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client satisfaction with newly streamlined or automated processes • Plans for automation of manual processes

Even if time does not permit extensive discussions involving all unit members at once, individuals or subgroups could explore the most important of these topics and report back to the unit during regular department meetings.

However your unit chooses to organize its preparation, make sure you document your process and discussions in summary form.

Access to and Interpretation of Supporting Evidence

The Office of Research and Planning (ORP) provides every instructional unit with a *Planning and Program Review Data* report containing information on student demographics and several effectiveness measures (see *Completing the Forms* section below). The Office also provides training annually for department chairs and others in understanding and interpreting that information.

The ORP can also help you develop your own data collection tools, or to interpret data you may already have in hand. For example, it is often useful to get direct input from your students, your alumni, community businesses that employ your students, or other clients regarding your program. A short survey or a focus group might be an appropriate method for gathering information on your clients' own perceptions. Please consult with the ORP for assistance in deciding whether such a project is feasible, or to discuss other needs or requests for evidence in the planning and program review process.

Examples of High-Quality Documents

Before you begin preparing your program review or annual planning documents in earnest, review exemplary submissions from prior cycles posted on the P&PRC website and the Planning and Program Review Blackboard Community website.

Completing the Forms

Program Review Form Questions

Note: Be sure to enter all the information requested at the top of the Program Review form:

- *Name of Unit*
- *Name of person preparing document*
- *Date of unit meeting to review document*
- *Reviewer names and positions*

The questions themselves are shown in italics. Comments and suggestions follow some questions, in roman type.

1. *Assume the reader doesn't know anything about your program. Please describe your program, including the following:*
 - a. *Organization (including staffing and structure)*
 - b. *Mission, or primary purpose*
 - c. *Whom you serve (including demographics)*
 - d. *What kind of services you provide*
 - e. *How you provide them*
2. *What external factors have a significant impact on your program? Please include the following as appropriate:*
 - a. *Budgetary constraints or opportunities*
 - b. *Service area demographics*
 - c. *Requirements of four-year institutions*
 - d. *Requirements of prospective employers*
 - e. *Job market*
 - f. *Developments in the field (both current and future)*
 - g. *Competition from other institutions*
 - h. *Requirements imposed by regulations, policies, standards, and other mandates*
3. *Please attach a list of all the SLOs/SAOs related to your program. In addition, please list any other quantitative or qualitative measures you have chosen to gauge your program's effectiveness.*

Comments and Suggestions

- In your response to this question, just list the measures; you will summarize the results and then reflect on them in your answers to the next two questions.
 - The Office of Research and Planning (ORP) provides to each instructional program a *Planning and Program Review Data* report containing information on student demographics and several effectiveness measures; see Question 6 below.
 - If you would like assistance in developing additional measures of effectiveness, please contact the ORP as soon as possible, to allow enough time for the office to process your request.
4. *Please summarize the results of each measure you have applied, including the results of any assessment of SLOs/SAOs you have done since your last program review.*

Comments and Suggestions

- Summarize the highlights or most important results of the effectiveness measures you applied.
 - You may append copies of the results of all outcomes assessments you have completed since your last program review, the *Planning and Program Review Data Report*, and the results of any other effectiveness measures you considered in preparing this document.
5. *Reflect on those results. What did you learn from them, and what improvements have you implemented or will you implement based on them? Be sure to include your SLOs/SAOs.*

Comments and Suggestions

- Take the opportunity in this section to offer your interpretation of the results.
 - What meaningful patterns or significant trends do you see in the results?
 - How do you interpret those patterns or trends?
 - What implications do the results have for improving your program?
6. *Please discuss your program's performance on each component of the applicable evaluation rubric. If you have already covered an item in your answer to Question 5, just refer to that response here, rather than repeating it.*
- a. *Instructional Program Health Evaluation Rubric*
- i) *Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)*
 - ii) *Needs-Based Curriculum* (Note: All instructional departments must consider the results of their most recent curriculum reviews in this section.)
 - iii) *Scheduling Matrix*
 - iv) *Course Retention Rate*
 - v) *Course Success Rate*
 - vi) *Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratio*
 - vii) *WSCH/FTEF Ratio*
 - viii) *Fill rate*
 - ix) *Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals*
 - x) *(Goals and Objectives are covered in your Three-Year Action Plan; do not address them here.)*
- b. *Noninstructional Program Effectiveness Evaluation Rubric*
- i) *Service Area and/or Student Learning Outcomes Process*
 - ii) *Additional Program Effectiveness Measures*
 - iii) *Program Effectiveness Criteria*
 - iv) *Innovation and Service Enhancement*
 - v) *Pattern of Service*
 - vi) *Partnerships*
 - vii) *Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals*
 - viii) *(Goals and Objectives are covered in your Three-Year Action Plan; do not address them here.)*

Comments and Suggestions

- The Office of Research and Planning (ORP) provides to each instructional program a *Planning and Program Review Data* report containing information on student demographics and on the following items: Course Retention Rate, Course Success Rate,

Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratio, WSCH/FTEF Ratio, and Fill Rate. If any figures in that report appear inaccurate for any reason, the unit leader should contact the ORP immediately with specific information about the apparent error, to ensure that the data are correct for the next cycle.

- Instructional programs must set a target for each of three measures: Course Retention Rate, Course Success Rate, and WSCH/FTEF ratio. In light of the institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators (see the CHC Educational Master Plan, *Institutional Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators* section) and your own experience in your program, set targets that are ambitious yet reasonable, consistent with maintaining or improving the quality of instruction.

7. *In answering both the questions below, please include all the areas in the following list, along with any other areas you regard as significant. If you have already covered an item in your answer to Question 6, just refer to that response here, rather than repeating it.*

- *Representativeness of population served*
- *Alternative modes and schedules of delivery*
- *Partnerships (internal and external)*
- *Implementation of best practices*
- *Efficiency in operations*
- *Efficiency in resource use*
- *Staffing*
- *Participation in shared governance (e.g., do unit members feel they participate effectively in planning and decision-making?)*
- *Professional development and training*
- *Group dynamics (e.g., how well do unit members work together?)*
- *Innovation*
- *Compliance with applicable mandates*

a. *What is going well and why?*

b. *What is not going well and why?*

Comments and Suggestions

- Please be specific in your descriptions and analysis, and use concrete examples.
- Focus on the most important high points (the elements of which you are most proud, or that might serve as a model for other programs) and the most troubling low points (the issues with which you are really struggling). But don't stop there—go on to discuss the implications of your findings for your program and for the College. Or, to put it another way, answer the time-honored question of the skeptical observer: So what?

8. *Tell us your vision: Where would you like your program to be three years from now?*

Comments and Suggestions

As you construct your vision, it might be helpful to think about some of the following questions:

- Imagine your program three years from now in an ideal future. You and your colleagues have done everything you possibly can to make the program excellent. Look around: What do you see?
- Describe the colleagues and partners inside and outside the institution with whom you would like to work in the ideal future.

- In the ideal future, what specific innovations, best practices, or other accomplishments would you share with a visiting out-of-state colleague?
 - What long-term impact would you like your program to have on the College and the community?
 - What strengths, opportunities, or new directions now exist on which you can capitalize in three years' time?
9. *Please provide an update on the unit's progress in meeting the goals and objectives identified in your last Three-Year Action Plan.*
10. *Reflect on your responses to all the previous questions. Complete the Three-Year Action Plan, entering the specific program goals and objectives you have formulated to maintain or enhance your strengths, or to address identified weaknesses. Assign an overall priority to each goal and each objective. In addition, enter any resources required to achieve each objective.*

Comments and Suggestions

See *Three-Year Action Plan Questions* below.

11. *Finally, describe how your mission, vision, and goals align with and contribute to the college's mission, vision, and goals, as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.*

Comments and Suggestions

- The response to this question should reflect the consensus of the unit as a whole, rather than the viewpoint of the unit leader or a minority of the membership.
- In the CHC Educational Master Plan, see the *Crafton Hills College Foundational Statements* and *Crafton Hills College Strategic Directions, Goals, and Objectives* sections.
- Also consult the *District Strategic Plan*, which is aligned with the CHC Educational Master Plan and is available on the SBCCD website at http://www.sbccd.cc.ca.us/About_the_District/Board_Imperatives_-a-_Planning_Documents/District_Strategic_Planning.aspx.

Three-Year Action Plan *Questions*

Note: Be sure to enter the Unit Name at the top of the Three-Year Action Plan form.

1. *Goal*

- a. You must enter at least one goal.
- b. At the program level, a goal is a major aspiration that the program intends to realize over the next three years.
- c. A program goal should have the following characteristics:
 - 1) Reflects the program's Big Picture
 - 2) Clearly serves the interests of the program as a whole
 - 3) Ambitious—even audacious!—yet attainable in principle
 - 4) Achievement of the goal represents a major improvement in the functioning of the program, and/or significant progress toward realization of the program's vision for the future.
 - 5) Relatively long-range and stable over time, until it is achieved
- d. Remember to list your goals in priority order, with Goal 1 being most important.
- e. Examples
 - 1) Meet the learning needs of underperforming students in the department.
 - 2) Ensure that the scope and timeliness of all department services are sufficient to meet client needs.
 - 3) Triple the fundraising capacity of the department.
 - 4) Maximize student engagement with the college.

2. *Objective*

- a. You must enter at least one objective under every goal.
- b. At the program level, an objective is a concrete, measurable milestone on the way to achieving a goal.
- c. Each program objective should have the following characteristics:
 - 1) Relevant and significant with respect to the applicable goal
 - 2) Brings the goal down to earth in clear language
 - 3) Achievement of the objective represents significant progress toward achievement of that goal
 - 4) Achievement of all the objectives related to a goal does not necessarily mean achievement of that goal; it often represents completion of one phase of work that will continue with the formulation of additional objectives and actions.
 - 5) Specific
 - 6) Measurable
 - 7) Reasonable with respect to:
 1. Scope
 2. Timeline
 - 8) Lends itself to formulation of a coherent set of actions
- d. Examples
 - 1) Implement an afternoon and evening tutoring program for at-risk students taking classes in the department.
 - 2) Evaluate the match between client needs and department services.
 - 3) Develop and implement an alumni relations information system.
 - 4) Compile a set of best practices for community-college student engagement.

3. *Overall Priority*

- a. Establishing the overall priority of each objective is important to the unit in deciding how best to pursue all the goals and objectives during the next year. It is also important in Crafton's overall planning process, during which objective priorities across units are consolidated at the Division, Area, and College levels.
- b. Enter the overall priority of each objective among all unit objectives, regardless of goal. For example, if you have three unit goals, each with three objectives, rank the nine objectives in priority order, and enter the priorities from 1 to 9 on the form.
- c. The initial priority order of any resource requests will be determined by the priority order of the objectives with which they are associated.
- d. On average, the objectives under high-priority goals tend to be higher in overall priority than objectives under lower-priority goals. However, it is perfectly all right to rank an objective under a lower-priority goal higher overall than an objective under a higher-priority goal. In the example, the priority of the objectives under Goal 1 might be 1, 3, and 4, while the priority of the objectives under Goal 3 might be 2, 7, and 8.

4. *Person Responsible*

List the title and name of the specific person with overall responsibility for ensuring that progress on the objective occurs as planned.

5. *Timeline*

Provide a realistic, reasonable estimate of the time period during which work on the objective will occur. The end of this period represents the target date for achievement of the objective.

6. *Resources*

- a. List all the significant resources needed to achieve the objective, including personnel, training, technology, information, equipment, supplies, and space.
- b. Every resource request must support at least one objective.
- c. If you know of potential external sources of support for listed resources, please identify them here.
- d. Consult the Long-Range Financial Plan and Forecast in the CHC Educational Master Plan to help you plan your resource requests over the next three years.
- e. To assist you in planning and prioritizing human resources, consult the District Staffing Plan when it becomes available.

7. *Rationale*

For each resource listed, enter the reason(s) the resource is needed to achieve the objective.

8. *Cost/Savings*

- a. Enter the estimated additional cost of, or savings associated with, each resource listed (compared to the current year's budget). Please label savings as such; if an entry has no label, the committee will assume it represents a cost.
- b. If you need help in estimating costs or savings, please see your Dean (in Instruction or Student Services), Vice President (in Administrative Services), or the President (in the President's Area).

9. *Actions/Tasks*

- a. At the program level, an action is one of a coherent set of specific steps that must be taken to achieve the objective.

- b. Each action should have the following characteristics:
 - 1) Specific
 - 2) Reasonable with respect to:
 - 1. Scope
 - 2. Timeline
 - 3. Workloads
 - 3) May show the specific person with overall responsibility for ensuring that the action occurs as planned
 - 4) Completion of all the actions under an objective means achievement of that objective.
- c. Describe each action at an appropriate level of detail. If you end up with 25 actions for one objective, you probably have included too much detail; if you end up with two, you might have included too little.
- d. List the actions in a logical sequence.

Annual Planning Form Questions

Note: Be sure to enter all the information requested at the top of the Annual Planning form:

- *Name of Unit*
- *Name of person preparing document*
- *Date of unit meeting to review document*
- *Reviewer names and positions/functions*

The questions themselves are shown in italics. Comments and suggestions follow some questions, in roman type.

1. *Have there been any changes in your program over the past year that have had a significant impact on its goals and/or effectiveness? If so, please describe the changes and their impact.*

Comments and Suggestions

- This is the section in which to report major changes, such as the following:
 - Gains or losses in personnel
 - New program accreditation standards
 - Major budget cuts or donations received
 - If you anticipate events or changes in the coming year that are likely to have such an impact, please describe them here.
 - If there have been no significant changes, please indicate that.
2. *Please summarize the results of program effectiveness measures you have applied since your last program review.*

Comments and Suggestions

- Summarize the highlights or most important results of the effectiveness measures you applied, including the results of any assessment of SLOs/SAOs.
 - Append copies of the results of all outcomes assessments you have completed since your last program review, the *Planning and Program Review Data Report* provided by the ORP, and the results of any other effectiveness measures you considered in preparing this document.
3. *Based on these results, what conclusions have you drawn about your program's progress since the last program review? Include as appropriate such areas as student performance, SLO/SAO cycle and results, curriculum, scheduling, alternative modes of delivery, outreach, partnerships, best practices, efficiency in using resources, group dynamics, strengths, weaknesses, innovations, etc.*

Comments and Suggestions

- The following represents one way to organize your discussion:
 - In what areas or issues have you made the most significant progress, and what are the implications of that progress for your program and for the College?
 - In what areas or issues have you found your progress insufficient or disappointing, and what are the implications of this lack of progress for your program and for the College?
- Please be specific in your descriptions and analysis, and use concrete examples.

- If your findings indicate the need for new or revised goals or objectives, be sure to include them in your *Three-Year Action Plan* (see below).
4. *Please provide a status update on meeting the program goals and objectives identified in your last Three-Year Action Plan.*

Comments and Suggestions

- Please list the program goals and objectives your unit adopted in its last *Three-Year Action Plan*, and briefly describe your current progress on each goal and objective.
 - If you did not complete a *Three-Year Action Plan* last year, please indicate that, and skip to the next question.
5. *Complete the Three-Year Action Plan, entering the specific program goals and objectives you have formulated to maintain or enhance your strengths, or to address identified weaknesses. Enter the goals in priority order, with Goal 1 being most important, and assign an overall priority to each objective. You may create new goals and objectives, and/or you may carry over goals and objectives from last year in original or modified form. In addition, enter any resources required to achieve each objective.*

Comments and Suggestions

See *Three-Year Action Plan Questions* above.

6. *If there is anything else you would like the committee to take into consideration in evaluating your annual plan, please describe it.*

Comments and Suggestions

You are free to include any information about your program that you wish in this section.

Initial Feedback and Submissions Program Review and Annual Planning

Required Formats for Submissions

Units may prepare and submit their documents in one of two ways:

- Use the web-based planning tool, WebPPR. WebPPR supports attaching supporting files. Training in the use of WebPPR is provided each year and on request.
- Create and submit a Microsoft Word file using either the program review or annual planning template (provided on the Planning and Program Review Committee website), whichever is applicable, along with any additional supporting files. (The structure of the templates mirrors that of WebPPR.) Files must be submitted via email to an address that the committee will specify before the first submission deadline. (If any of your files are too large for the email system to accommodate, please see your dean or director for alternative submission methods.)

The Committee does not accept paper submissions. Units wishing to submit supporting documents currently available only on paper (including the required *Program Review/Annual Plan Signature Sheet*) must scan those documents into Portable Document Format (PDF) form. If you do not have access to a suitable scanning system, ask for help from your dean's or director's secretary or assistant.

Instructional Disciplines

1. Faculty, in collaboration with their faculty chair, complete the program review and planning documents. The unit leader and unit members should work with their dean to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
2. The faculty chair sends the unit's documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable dean and the Vice President.
3. The applicable dean and the Vice President provide feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
4. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
5. The faculty chair is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the dean.
6. The dean submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.

Learning and Instructional Resources

1. The unit leader and unit members complete the program review and planning documents. They should work with their supervisor, coordinator, or director to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
2. Each supervisor, coordinator, or director sends the unit's program review and planning documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable dean.
3. The dean provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
4. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
5. Each supervisor, coordinator, or director is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the dean.
6. The dean submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.

Student Services

1. Counseling
 - a. A Counseling Committee represents all faculty counselors in Student Services and completes the unit's program review and planning documents. The Counseling Committee should work with the dean to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
 - b. The Counseling Committee sends the unit's documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable dean.
 - c. The dean provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
 - d. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
 - e. The Counseling Committee is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the dean.
 - f. The dean submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.
2. Health and Wellness and DSPS
 - a. The unit leader and unit members complete the program review and planning documents. They should work with their dean to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
 - b. The coordinators send the program review and annual planning documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable dean.
 - c. The dean provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.

- d. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
 - e. The coordinator is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the dean.
 - f. The dean submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.
3. All Other Programs
- a. The unit leader and unit members complete the program review and planning documents. They should work with their dean to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
 - b. All other directors or deans send their units' program review and annual planning documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable dean or Vice President.
 - c. The dean or Vice President provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
 - d. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
 - e. The director or dean is responsible for submitting the final draft of the unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the dean or Vice President.
 - f. The dean or Vice President submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.

Administrative Services

1. The unit leader and unit members complete the program review and planning documents. They should work with their director to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
2. Each supervisor sends the unit's program review and planning documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the applicable director or Vice President.
3. The director or Vice President provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
4. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should

strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.

5. The supervisor is responsible for submitting the final draft of unit's documents, or sending a notice that the final draft is available on WebPPR, to the director or Vice President.
6. The director or Vice President submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.

President's Area

1. The unit leader and unit members complete the program review and planning documents. They should work with their director to ensure that the quality of their documents (including the *Three-Year Action Plan*) is at least adequate for submission.
2. Directors send their units' program review and planning documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to the President.
3. The President provides feedback to the unit, but cannot make changes to the documents.
4. The unit must make improvements to the documents based upon any portion of the feedback that indicates the need for such improvements, or give the rationale for not doing so in a separate document. In particular, if the feedback indicates that the goals, objectives, actions, and/or resource requests in the *Three-Year Action Plan* need improvements, the unit should strive to make those improvements. If the *Three-Year Action Plan* is not completed properly, the unit's priorities might be omitted from the Division, Area, and College priority lists.
5. The director submits the final documents, along with comments, or sends a notice that the final documents are available on WebPPR, to the Planning and Program Review Committee.

Technology Resource Requests

Each unit must forward a copy of any *Three-Year Action Plan* that includes technology resource requests to the Campus Director of Technology Services, to help inform that department's annual planning, and record the date it was sent.

Submission Checklist

Please use the following checklist to ensure that your unit completes each step in the submission process.

Done?	Step
	Unit invites participants, and completes <i>Participation in Annual Planning or Program Review</i> form.
	Unit holds and documents preparatory discussions.
	Unit scans supporting documents into PDF format as needed.
	Unit completes an initial draft of each section of the program review or annual planning documents using the Word template or WebPPR, and sends documents* or notice to applicable Division manager(s).
	Applicable Division manager(s) provide(s) feedback.
	Unit responds to feedback by making improvements to the documents or providing rationale for not doing so.
	Unit completes <i>Program Review/Annual Plan Signature Sheet</i> .
	Unit leader submits final documents to applicable Division manager.
	Unit forwards copy of <i>Three-Year Action Plan</i> to the Campus Director of Technology Services if it includes technology resource requests.
	Division manager emails the set of final documents*, or sends notice of availability on WebPPR, to P&PRC.
	P&PRC notifies Division manager and unit of receipt of final documents.

* The set of final documents (whether emailed or in WebPPR) must include, at a minimum, the following:

- Completed Program Review or Annual Planning Form
- Completed *Three-Year Action Plan*
- Completed *Participation in Annual Planning or Program Review* form
- Completed *Program Review/Annual Plan Signature Sheet*
- Supporting documents

Evaluation Process for Program Review

1. The evaluation process consists of two parts, each based on a scoring rubric (see the Appendix and the P&PRC website for the rubrics):
 - a. An evaluation of the quality (e.g., completeness, clarity, reliance on evidence) of the submitted documents.
 - b. A substantive evaluation of each program's health or effectiveness, based on the information contained in the submitted documents.
2. The P&PRC co-chairs invite the applicable unit leader (and up to two other unit representatives he or she may wish to bring) to attend a portion of the P&PRC meeting at which initial consideration of the unit will occur. In an informal discussion at that meeting:
 - a. Unit members may ask questions or make comments about the process or its outcomes.
 - b. Unit members can answer clarifying questions that committee members might have about the unit's documents, procedures, evidence, or other matters related to document quality or program health or effectiveness.
3. The co-chairs distribute the submitted documents, or a notice that they are ready for review on WebPPR, to all P&PRC members, along with the evaluation rubrics and scoring sheets, at least one week before the meeting for initial consideration of the unit.
4. Before the meeting for initial consideration of the unit, each P&PRC member reviews the unit's documents carefully, notes any questions he or she might have, and assigns preliminary scores on both document quality and program health or effectiveness.
5. Unit representatives meet briefly with the committee.
6. After the departure of the unit representatives, P&PRC members discuss the unit's documents, arrive at a consensus on document quality and program health or effectiveness, and record the results, which may include brief explanatory comments.
7. The co-chairs or designees prepare the *Committee Feedback and Recommendations* report based on the evaluation results. P&PRC members review, approve, and sign the feedback report before the co-chairs send it to the unit.
8. The P&PRC co-chairs send the *Committee Feedback and Recommendations* report to the unit leader, who acknowledges receipt. The report contains the following sections:
 - a. Description of purposes of planning and program review
 - b. Explanation of how to use the feedback
 - c. Summary of overall comments
 - d. Document quality rubric results and comments
 - 1) Note that the committee may require the unit to revise and resubmit its documents this year, or undertake the program review process again next year, if those documents are of such poor quality that the program review does not warrant consideration in its current form. In either case, the unit's priorities in goals, objectives, and resource requests will not be considered in the institutional priorities process (see below) in the current cycle.
 - 2) Program review documents are not to be revised and resubmitted unless the committee expressly requests it.
 - e. Program health/effectiveness rubric results and comments
9. If the unit chooses to submit a written response to the report, it has two weeks after receipt of the report to do so.
10. The *Committee Feedback and Recommendations* reports for all units, together with any written responses, are made available as backup to the P&PRC's *Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness* package when it is submitted to the President (see below).

11. After the evaluation of all units in a given cycle is complete, the P&PRC prepares a *Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness* package, and the co-chairs submit it to the President. The package includes the following:
 - a. The *Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness*, which contains for each program a brief evaluative summary and a designation in one of four categories:
 - 1) Exemplary Programs, which stand out from the rest for a variety of reasons.
 - 2) Strong Programs, which meet or exceed rubric standards on all variables and submitted exceptionally strong program review documents.
 - 3) Healthy Programs with Specific Concerns, which require management guidance in a small number of specific areas.
 - 4) Distressed Programs, which require assistance from Senior Management in addressing specific concerns by identifying the steps needed for improvement.
 - b. Two quantitative summaries of rubric results for both document quality and program health or effectiveness, one for instructional programs and one for noninstructional programs.
12. The President informs the entire campus community of the results of the evaluation process by attaching the *Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness* package to her Planning and Program Review Process Notification email. (See also *Institutional Priorities Process* below.) The same information is posted on the internal P&PRC website.

Evaluation Process for Annual Planning

The evaluation process for annual planning is under review by the P&PRC as of publication of this edition of the Handbook. All units will be notified of the process to be used for 2010-11, and this Handbook will be updated, as soon as the committee reaches its conclusions.

Institutional Priorities Process

Every unit submits a *Three-Year Action Plan* containing goals, objectives, actions, and resource requests, regardless of whether it is performing a full program review or is engaged in the annual planning process. These plans are an important component of developing institutional priorities each year. The unit-level objectives, with any associated resource requests, are rolled up successively into consolidated lists at the Division, Area, and College levels, in accord with the following process:

1. The Division manager discusses the units' objectives (and any associated resource requests) with the unit leaders, and documents those discussions in summary form. Based substantially on the unit leaders' input, he or she creates a consolidated divisional priority list of objectives (and any associated resource requests), which may combine unit objectives and/or include objectives in addition to those formulated by the units. The Division manager submits the divisional list and discussion summary in electronic form to the applicable Area manager and to the Planning and Program Review Committee (P&PRC), along with the final unit planning and program review documents, as described above.
2. The Area manager discusses the divisional objectives (and any associated resource requests) with the Division managers, and documents those discussions in summary form. Based substantially on the Division managers' input, he or she creates a consolidated Area priority list of objectives (and any associated resource requests), which may combine divisional objectives and/or include objectives in addition to those in the divisional lists. The Area manager submits the Area list and discussion summary in electronic form to the President and to the P&PRC.
3. The P&PRC reviews the Area priority lists (and divisional or unit lists as needed), and recommends a consolidated institutional priority list of objectives (and any associated resource requests), which may combine Area objectives and/or include objectives in addition to those in the Area lists. It submits the recommendation to the President.
4. The President, with the advice of the Cabinet and the Crafton Council, creates the final institutional priority list of objectives (and any associated resource requests), based substantially on the P&PRC recommendation.
5. The President then sends a memo to the P&PRC acknowledging receipt of the P&PRC recommendation, and identifying and providing the rationale for any significant departures from that recommendation.
6. The President informs the campus community of the final institutional priorities by attaching a copy of the memo to P&PRC and the final *CHC Annual Planning Priorities* document to the Planning and Program Review Process Notification email. The same information is posted on the P&PRC website.

Implementation and Documentation

All units are expected to take the necessary steps to achieve the goals and objectives they have identified in their Three-Year Action Plans according to the timelines and priorities they have specified. Actions under objectives that are contingent on the unit's receipt of requested resources may be delayed, of course, if those resources are not available. In such cases, the unit should turn its attention to those objectives that do not require additional resources.

Units must document their progress on each objective, in part to ensure that the status report on goals and objectives in the next planning and program review cycle is complete.

Evaluation and Improvement of the Planning and Program Review Process

Each Spring, after both program review and annual planning processes for the cycle are complete, the P&PRC evaluates those processes, identifies any needed improvements, and implements those improvements in the next cycle. The primary elements of the evaluation include the following:

1. An ORP survey of process participants on the clarity, usefulness, and other characteristics of the process. In addition to quantitative ratings, the survey provides the opportunity for respondents to make suggestions to programs that will participate in the process next year, recommendations for improving the process, and any other suggestions or comments they wish.
2. A qualitative review of the process and schedule from committee members' perspective.
3. Identification of training needs for participants and managers, and scheduling of training sessions.
4. The review and, if necessary, revision of internal committee procedures, including meeting schedules.
5. The review and, if necessary, revision of forms, rubrics, website contents, and this Handbook.

Accreditation Standards

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) sets standards for two-year institutions in California, Hawaii, and the Pacific. To retain its accreditation, every college must demonstrate that it meets those standards. Nearly all the standards have planning and evaluation components, but the following is the one most closely related to planning and program review:

Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.
2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.
3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.
4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.
5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.
6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.
7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Glossary

The following table presents definitions of terms as they are used in this Handbook.

[Note to P&PRC members reviewing the Handbook: Please include in your comments any terms and suggested definitions you think ought to be added to this Glossary. Thanks!]

Term	Definition
Action	One of a coherent set of specific steps that must be taken to achieve an objective (see <i>Three-Year Action Plan Questions</i> above). Also known as “activity.”
Area	Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, or the President’s Area.
Area manager	A Vice President (for all the divisions in his or her Area) or the President (for all the departments in the President’s Area).
Division	A set of units that typically report to a single dean or director.
Division manager	The position responsible for the set of units that comprise a given division; typically a dean or director.
Goal	A major aspiration that the organization intends to realize over the next three years (see <i>Three-Year Action Plan Questions</i> above).
Objective	A concrete, measurable milestone on the way to achieving a goal (see <i>Three-Year Action Plan Questions</i> above).
Unit	The smallest organizational structure that performs planning and program review.
Unit leader	The position responsible for completing the unit’s planning and program review process, which may be a faculty chair, supervisor, coordinator, director, or dean.

Appendix

Crafton Hills College Planning and Program Review Committee Document Evaluation Rubric Program Review Form

	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Each Question	<p>Answers all parts of the question completely with relevant information. Well-written answer conveys meaning clearly. Includes or refers to relevant evidence, concrete examples. Shows evidence of thoughtful consideration of the question and the issues relevant to it. Response indicates that the unit followed directions and suggestions on the Form and in the “Completing the Forms” section of the <i>Handbook</i>.</p>	<p>Answers incompletely or not at all, or includes irrelevant information. Meaning is unclear. Includes insufficient evidence and/or examples to support assertions. Shows insufficient evidence of thoughtful consideration. Response indicates that the unit did not follow directions and suggestions on the Form and/or in the “Completing the Forms” section of the <i>Handbook</i>.</p>
Overall	<p>Responses indicate that the unit followed <i>Handbook</i> directions and suggestions with respect to the planning and program review process; for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad participation and consensus, documented on the Forms • Departmental discussions of significant issues • Adherence to the planning and program review schedule <p>Overall, makes a persuasive case that the program is maintaining or increasing its strengths and addressing its weaknesses.</p>	<p>Responses indicate that the unit did not follow <i>Handbook</i> directions and suggestions with respect to the planning and program review process. Overall, does not make a persuasive case that the program is maintaining or increasing its strengths and addressing its weaknesses.</p>

Question	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p>1. Assume the reader doesn't know anything about your program. Please describe your program, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organization (including staffing and structure) b. Mission, or primary purpose c. Whom you serve (including demographics) d. What kind of services you provide e. How you provide them 		
<p>2. What external factors have a significant impact on your program? Please include the following as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Budgetary constraints or opportunities b. Service area demographics c. Requirements of four-year institutions d. Requirements of prospective employers e. Job market f. Developments in the field (both current and future) g. Competition from other institutions h. Requirements imposed by regulations, policies, standards, and other mandates 		
<p>3. Please attach a list of all the SLOs/SAOs related to your program. In addition, please list any other quantitative or qualitative measures you have chosen to gauge your program's effectiveness.</p>		
<p>4. Please summarize the results of each measure you have applied, including the results of any assessment of SLOs/SAOs you have done since your last program review.</p>		
<p>5. Reflect on those results. What did you learn from them, and what improvements have you implemented or will you implement based on them? Be sure to include your SLOs/SAOs.</p>		

Question	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<p>6. Please discuss your program’s performance on each component of the applicable evaluation rubric. If you have already covered an item in your answer to Question 5, just refer to that response here, rather than repeating it.</p> <p>a. Instructional Program Health Evaluation Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) ii. Needs-Based Curriculum iii. Scheduling Matrix iv. Course Retention Rate v. Course Success Rate vi. Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Ratio vii. WSCH/FTEF Ratio viii. Fill rate ix. Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals x. (Goals and Objectives are covered in your Three-Year Action Plan; do not address them here.) <p>b. Noninstructional Program Effectiveness Evaluation Rubric</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Service Area and/or Student Learning Outcomes Process ii. Additional Program Effectiveness Measures iii. Program Effectiveness Criteria iv. Innovation and Service Enhancement v. Pattern of Service vi. Partnerships vii. Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals viii. (Goals and Objectives are covered in your Three-Year Action Plan; do not address them here.) 		
<p>7. In answering both the questions below, please include all the areas in the following list, along with any other areas you regard as significant. If you have already covered an item in your answer to Question 6, just refer to that response here, rather than repeating it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representativeness of population served • Alternative modes and schedules of delivery • Partnerships (internal and external) • Implementation of best practices • Efficiency in operations • Efficiency in resource use • Staffing • Participation in shared governance (e.g., do unit members feel they participate effectively in planning and decision-making?) • Professional development and training • Group dynamics (e.g., how well do unit members work together?) • Innovation • Compliance with applicable mandates <p>a. What is going well and why?</p> <p>b. What is not going well and why?</p>		
<p>8. Tell us your vision: Where would you like your program to be three years from now?</p>		
<p>9. Please provide an update on the unit’s progress in meeting the goals and objectives identified in your last Three-Year Action Plan.</p>		
<p>10. Reflect on your responses to all the previous questions. Complete the Three-Year Action Plan, entering the specific program goals and objectives you have formulated to maintain or enhance your strengths, or to address identified weaknesses. Assign an overall priority to each goal and each objective. In addition, enter any resources required to achieve each objective.</p>		
<p>11. Finally, describe how your mission, vision, and goals align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals, as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p>		
<p>Overall Assessment</p>		

Crafton Hills College Planning and Program Review Committee Document Evaluation Rubric Annual Planning Form

	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Each Question, 1-5	<p>Answers all parts of the question completely with relevant information. Well-written answer conveys meaning clearly. Includes or refers to relevant evidence, concrete examples. Shows evidence of thoughtful consideration of the question and the issues relevant to it. Response indicates that the unit followed directions and suggestions on the Form and in the “Completing the Forms” section of the <i>Handbook</i>.</p>	<p>Answers incompletely or not at all, or includes irrelevant information. Meaning is unclear. Includes insufficient evidence and/or examples to support assertions. Shows insufficient evidence of thoughtful consideration. Response indicates that the unit did not follow directions and suggestions on the Form and/or in the “Completing the Forms” section of the <i>Handbook</i>.</p>
Question 6	Declined to respond, or if present, adds to understanding of program.	Only if present, adds little or nothing to understanding of program.
Overall	<p>Responses indicate that the unit followed <i>Handbook</i> directions and suggestions with respect to the planning and program review process; for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad participation and consensus, documented on the Forms • Departmental discussions of significant issues • Adherence to the planning and program review schedule <p>Overall, makes a persuasive case that the program is maintaining or increasing its strengths and addressing its weaknesses.</p>	<p>Responses indicate that the unit did not follow <i>Handbook</i> directions and suggestions with respect to the planning and program review process. Overall, does not make a persuasive case that the program is maintaining or increasing its strengths and addressing its weaknesses.</p>

Question	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
1. Have there been any changes in your program over the past year that have had a significant impact on its goals and/or effectiveness? If so, please describe the changes and their impact.		
2. Please summarize the results of program effectiveness measures you have applied since your last program review.		
3. Based on these results, what conclusions have you drawn about your program’s progress since the last program review? Include as appropriate such areas as student performance, SLO/SAO cycle and results, curriculum, scheduling, alternative modes of delivery, outreach, partnerships, best practices, efficiency in using resources, group dynamics, strengths, weaknesses, innovations, etc.		
4. Please provide a status update on meeting the program goals and objectives identified in your last Three-Year Action Plan.		
5. Complete the Three-Year Action Plan, entering the specific program goals and objectives you have formulated to maintain or enhance your strengths, or to address identified weaknesses. Enter the goals in priority order, with Goal 1 being most important, and assign an overall priority to each objective. You may create new goals and objectives, and/or you may carry over goals and objectives from last year in original or modified form. In addition, enter any resources required to achieve each objective.		
6. If there is anything else you would like the committee to take into consideration in evaluating your annual plan, please describe it.		
Overall Assessment		

Crafton Hills College Planning and Program Review Committee Instructional Program Health Evaluation Rubric

Variable	Rating	Score	Comments
6.a.i. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	3 = SLOs have been defined, assessed, and evaluated, and have consistently been used to inform instruction. 2 = SLO cycle is only partially complete, or the outcomes process has not been consistently used to inform instruction. 1 = SLOs have not yet been assessed.		
6.a.ii. Needs-Based Curriculum	3 = Curriculum is up-to-date and demonstrably needs-based (e.g.: survey, environmental scan, articulation agreement, etc.). 2 = Curriculum is up-to-date and not demonstrably needs-based. 1 = Curriculum is not up-to-date and there is no evidence showing that it is needs-based.		
6.a.iii. Scheduling Matrix	3 = Unit has developed a three-year matrix of courses offered in each term, and matrix is revised as needed. 1 = Unit does not have a matrix of course offerings.		
6.a.iv. Course Retention Rate	3 = Unit has set a sound target and has either met the target or made significant progress towards meeting the target. 2 = Unit has set a sound target, but has neither declined or made significant progress. 1 = Unit has not set a sound target and/or has declined.		
6.a.v. Course Success Rate	3 = Unit has set a sound target and has either met the target or made significant progress towards meeting the target. 2 = Unit has set a sound target, but has neither declined nor made significant progress. 1 = Unit has not set a sound target and/or has declined.		
6.a.vi. Full-Time / Part-Time Faculty Ratio	3 = Full-time faculty load (FTEF) ratio is 75% or higher. 2 = Full-time faculty load (FTEF) ratio is 62 – 74.9%. 1 = Full-time faculty load (FTEF) ratio is less than 62%.		
6.a.vii. WSCH / FTEF Ratio	3 = Unit has set a sound target and has either met the target or made significant progress towards meeting the target. 2 = Unit has set a sound target, but has neither declined nor made significant progress. 1 = Unit has not set a sound target and/or has declined.		
6.a.viii. Fill Rate	3 = The number of enrollments at Census divided by the cap is 80% or higher. 2 = The number of enrollments at Census divided by the cap is 70-79.9%. 1 = The number of enrollments at Census divided by the cap is less than 70%.		

Variable	Rating	Score	Comments
6.a.ix. Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals	<p>3 = Unit has demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals substantially align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>2 = Unit has demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals only partially align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p>		
Goals	<p>3 = Unit has identified goals that are clearly related to the results of its self-evaluation, reflect the big picture, and are ambitious but attainable. Each goal’s scope is such that its achievement would represent significant progress.</p> <p>2 = Unit has identified goals that are somewhat related to the results of its self-evaluation, only moderately reflect the big picture, and/or are either not ambitious enough or not attainable. Each goal’s scope is such that its achievement would represent moderate progress.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not identified goals, and/or goals are unrelated to the results of its self-evaluation, fail to reflect the big picture, and/or are trivial. Each goal is of such limited scope that its achievement represents insignificant progress.</p>		
Objectives	<p>3 = Unit has identified objectives that are concrete, specific, measurable, and reasonable with respect to scope and timeline. If an objective includes resources, the rationale shows that they are necessary to achievement of the objective.</p> <p>2 = Unit has identified objectives that are only partially concrete, specific, measurable, and reasonable with respect to scope and timeline. If an objective includes resources, the rationale shows that they are somewhat related to achievement of the objective.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not identified objectives, or objectives meet few or none of the characteristics specified in ratings 2 and 3.</p>		

Crafton Hills College Planning and Program Review Committee Non-Instructional Program Effectiveness Evaluation Rubric

Variable		Rating	Score	Comments
6.b.i.	Service Area and/or Student Learning Outcomes: Process	3 = Outcomes have been defined, assessed, evaluated, and have consistently been used to inform services offered by the program. 2 = Outcomes cycle is partially complete, or the outcomes process has not been consistently used to inform services offered by the program. 1 = Outcomes have not yet been assessed.		
6.b.ii.	Additional Program Effectiveness Measures	3 = At least two additional useful effectiveness measures have been defined and applied. 2 = At least one additional useful effectiveness measure has been defined and applied. 1 = No additional effectiveness measures have been defined and applied.		
6.b.iii	Program Effectiveness Criteria	3 = Program has set criteria for all effectiveness measures, has met the criteria, and has developed strategies for improving services if any are needed or identified. 2 = Program has set criteria for effectiveness measures, has not met the criteria specified, but has developed strategies for improving services if any are needed or identified. 1 = No Program Effectiveness Criteria have been developed.		
6.b.iv.	Innovation and Service Enhancement	3=The program has added a significant innovation or enhancement within the past year and has collected and analyzed data to help determine the efficacy of the innovation. 2= The program has added a significant innovation or enhancement within the past year that impacts service to students or clients, but has not collected or analyzed data to help determine the efficacy of the innovation. 1=The unit does not describe innovations or enhancements to services.		
6.b.v.	Pattern of Service	3= Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence indicates that the services provided by the program meet the needs of students or clients. 2= Quantitative and/or qualitative evidence indicates that the services provided by the program meet some student or client needs, and the unit describes plans to improve and/or expand the current pattern of service. 1=There are significant gaps in the pattern of service, no plans to remedy the gaps, and/or no evidence was provided by the program.		
6.b.vi.	Partnerships	3=The unit has at least two external or internal partnerships that substantially impact the quality of services to students or clients. 2=The unit has one external or internal partnership that substantially impacts the quality of services to students or clients. 1=The unit has no external or internal partnerships.		

Variable	Rating	Score	Comments
6.b.vi. Alignment with CHC Mission, Vision, and Goals	<p>3 = Unit has demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals substantially align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>2 = Unit has demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals only partially align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not demonstrated that its mission, vision, and goals align with and contribute to the college’s mission, vision, and goals as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan.</p>		
Goals	<p>3 = Unit has identified goals that are clearly related to the results of its self-evaluation, reflect the big picture, and are ambitious but attainable. Each goal’s scope is such that its achievement would represent significant progress.</p> <p>2 = Unit has identified goals that are somewhat related to the results of its self-evaluation, only moderately reflect the big picture, and/or are either not ambitious enough or not attainable. Each goal’s scope is such that its achievement would represent moderate progress.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not identified goals, and/or goals are unrelated to the results of its self-evaluation, fail to reflect the big picture, and/or are trivial. Each goal is of such limited scope that its achievement represents insignificant progress.</p>		
Objectives	<p>3 = Unit has identified objectives that are concrete, specific, measurable, and reasonable with respect to scope and timeline. If an objective includes resources, the rationale shows that they are necessary to achievement of the objective.</p> <p>2 = Unit has identified objectives that are only partially concrete, specific, measurable, and reasonable with respect to scope and timeline. If an objective includes resources, the rationale shows that they are somewhat related to achievement of the objective.</p> <p>1 = Unit has not identified objectives, or objectives meet few or none of the characteristics specified in ratings 2 and 3.</p>		