Background

This assessment of our Planning and Program Review processes was conducted by the President’s Process Assessment Committee (PAC). This assessment was conducted within the context of recommendations made by the ACCJC based on our 2008 Site Visit and Evaluations Report. Recommendations 2 and 4 focused specifically on Planning and Program Review. The recommendations had the same wording, with one relating to Standard I.B.5 and the other to Standard III.D.1; they are combined as follows:

The team recommends that the college improve its program review process by enhancing the nature and use of data to meet Standard I.B.5 (Recommendation 2) and Standard III.D.1 .d (Recommendation 4) and by codifying the links between program review, budget decision-making, facilities planning, and information technology decisions that support student learning outcomes. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4) (III.D.1 .d)

Summary of the Assessment Process

Five weekly rounds of online input were conducted between April 6, 2012 and May 7, 2012, followed by an in-person review session on May 11, 2012. The following were the topics for each Round:

Round 1: Progress Report to Commission (03/15/09); Mid-Term Report to Commission (03/15/11)
Round 2: The glossary of Ohlone planning terminology
Round 3: The strategic and annual planning charts and process descriptions; The strategic plan goals and objectives assessment process; Program and Service Review annual process
Round 4: PIO Prioritization Process for Resource Allocation
Round 5: Survey based on the WASC Rubric for Effectiveness in Planning and Program Review

PAC also met on May 30 and July 11 to refine the recommendations. The recommendations were reviewed by the Executive Staff on June 26, July 10 and August 14; and by the College Council on June 11, July 16, and August 22 (semi-annual retreat).

Detailed Report of Assessment Process and Findings

In general, the assessment indicates we are doing very well with our Planning and Program Review processes.

However, the Program Improvement Objective process, especially the PIO Prioritization for Resource Allocation process, needs significant review for improvement. This will be presented in detail in the section on Round 4 below.

The following is a summary of the input received for each of the Rounds:

Round 1: Progress Report to Commission (03/15/09); Mid-Term Report to Commission (03/15/11)

There seems to be general agreement that we are doing what we said we are doing, and what we said we would do, in both the 2009 Progress Report and the 2011 Mid-Term Report.

An area mentioned for improvement was the PIO process, which will be addressed in more detail in Round 4 below.
Round 2: The Glossary of Ohlone Planning Terminology

The Glossary is seen as a useful guide in understanding our Planning and Program Review processes,

A number of suggestions for improvement were made:

Include a list of our shared governance committees and their reporting structures.
Include the Ohlone Mission Statement after the definition of Mission.
Add a definition for Program Achievement Outcomes: “Give broad overarching direction to the program and support program improvement.”
For the definition of Assessment, specify assessment for outcomes “at the course, program and college levels.”
For the definition of Program and Services Review, add Instructional Service and President’s Office.
For the definition of Program Improvement Objectives, modify as follows;
Measurable objectives identified in Program and Services Review to improve the program or service in support of student learning and success, including what will be achieved and why. The PIO consists of four components: Objective Statement (includes what will be achieved and why); Action Plan (steps and resource requests); Assessment Plan; Rationale and Relationship to College. The objectives will be reviewed and revised on a regular basis.
For the definition of Resources, change “program objectives” to “program improvement objectives.”
For the definition of Strategic Planning Cycle, add that it is a five-year cycle.
For the definition of Student Learning Outcomes, College Level, specify these have been defined as our General Education Plan A outcomes.
For the definition of Student Learning Impacts, add Instructional Services and President’s Office.

Round 3: The strategic and annual planning charts and process descriptions; The strategic plan goals and objectives assessment process; Program and Service Review annual process

There seems to be general consensus that annual planning charts and process descriptions are still accurate and the assessment process for strategic plan goals and objective is effective.

One respondent stated the following, which should be discussed further:

I do not feel that we have complete alignment with budgeting nor do I feel we have a process that is sensitive to external mandates. Limited resources/ challenges in terms of budget, personnel and simply time… are not brought into consideration. I want to think about this more but I am thinking we could add one item titled ( current situations) to the model on page 2 that might show that the college has to remain nimble in how it sets priorities. The ‘environmental scan” and “gap” analysis is part of this but does not cover budget reductions, new state requirements….

There seems to be agreement that the Program and Services Review process is sound and continuing to improve.

There is concern that more emphasis is needed on assessment of PIOs.

One respondent expressed concern about the nature of the PIO statements and the confusion and frustration it seems to cause, which should be discussed further:

The whole discipline applied to identifying the PIOs in “outcomes” language is not very effective if we are expecting staff to join in and take part! Even with training, it is very hard to know what is being asked for when the description is something like…”Through innovative programs and services, improve student learning and achievement….” Staff feel adverse to even apply themselves because to communicate in this way is so foreign and their attempts are immediately highlighted, sometimes publically, as not being “adequate or complete”, “not filling out the rubric” etc. This discipline works well for faculty and fairly well for managers who apply themselves to it. The CurricUNET reporting tool, manuals and training have really helped but…we need to be more aware of how removed this type of process is from a front line employee experience.
There were a number of other specific suggestions for Program and Services Review:

- We need to ensure that the reviews are continually updated.
- We should make more detailed information on budget and staffing levels available for the review process. The link between Program and Services Review and budget analysis and planning has improved but needs to be further explored and improved.
- The Student Services area will use an earlier spring/summer timeline for updating reviews to avoid workload issues in the fall semester.

There are also a number of concerns about the PIO process, which will be reviewed in more detail under Round 4.  

Round 4: PIO Prioritization Process for Resource Allocation

The input reveals that this is an area that needs the most attention for improvement.

Deb Parziale worked with the PIO Committee on an assessment of the process encompassing much of the concern:

1. PIO Resource Allocation Process Chart

- Use for PIOs needing resources only.
- Take Mini-Grants out of this process and create a separate process for them.
- Consider new time line (See Attachment B):
- Give more specific guidelines for prioritization (See #5 below)

2. PIO Rubric

- Consider wording updates for the 0.29.2011 version on attached 5.3.2012 draft.
- Consider creating rubric for Assessment Plan and PIO Assessment page.
- Consider asking all who evaluate the PIOs to use the same rubric.

3. Rationale statement related to College Goals, Objectives, and impact beyond program issues

Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs) are not clearly related to the college objectives and do not clearly address the impact beyond the program. We need to continue the efforts to improve this by emphasizing activities already in place:

- Stem of the question within CurricUNET Program Review module;
- CurricUNET Program Review help boxes;
- PIO Prioritization Rubric used by the PIO Committee;
- “Writing Effective PIO” workshops;
- Handouts on the PIO section of the Program and Services Review website (now moved to the President’s Planning and Program Review website);
- Discussing this issue many times in CC meetings;
- Thus this issue needs further dialog and resolution

4. Resource Request Issues

Currently the Resource Request section of the CurricUNET program review module has open-ended text boxes. We see a variety of information included in this section from very general to very detailed. There have been many discussions over the last few years about including the need for more guidance on what should be included in these boxes. This information is best generated by managers who have control over the budget. On February 21, 2012, Steve Thyberg demonstrated a page from the Modesto Junior College CurricUNET Program Review module that requires more detailed resource request information and allows for prioritization. Screen shots are available to be looked at to determine if this is something that may be helpful for Ohlone.
5. PIO Prioritization Issues

Determine how assessment of previous or current year’s PIO fits into the process.

Some PIOs and resource requests are comprehensive, including many items; others are very specific and may include only one resource request. This confounds the prioritization process.

PIO Prioritization – Employees are asked to place all relevant PIOs within the module for planning purposes. We need to know what the priority PIOs are for each academic year.

Currently requested CurricUNET Program Review Module modifications:

- PIOs, action plans, and resource requests will be date stamped with the academic year.
- The PIO Reporting Tool will be date stamped with the academic year and will pull PIOs, and related action plans and resource requests by the Academic Year.

Many have said that they would like to prioritize their PIOs, however, do not have a way to do that within CurricUNET. Possible solutions:

- Include a priority ranking in parenthesis at the end of the PIO statement.
- Investigate if the prioritization processes used by Modesto Junior College for resources could be applied to our PIO process.
- Request that PIOs marked as “Discontinued” or “Completed” in the PIO Assessment page not be included in the PIO Reporting Tool for the current academic year.
- Assign all PIOs a unique number or identifier, to help track the PIOs in the system. This way we have a better way of locating PIOs whose text has been modified at the VP level. (This could also help departments rank PIOs.)
- Revise the PIO Reporting Tool to make the extracted information easier to read. This could be accomplished by making PIOs read vertically instead of horizontally. Given the differences in PIO content across departments (i.e., not all PIOs require facility resources, so this area is left blank for many), a spreadsheet may not be the most effective way to display PIO information.
- Consider providing guidelines for PIO prioritization that all are aware of; may need to update annually.

Examples of issues the PIO Committee discussed:

- If a project is already a part of the Facility Master Plan and will be funded by Measure G, then it will not be included in the top 20.
- District Wide PIOs will be a part of the top 20 (as long as they meet rubric criteria)
- Faculty hires do not need to be a part of the top 20, since there is a separate process.
- There is not a separate process for staff hires, so they should be included in the top 20.
- Consider assigning a “PIO Steward” to the process to usher the PIOs from one stage of review to the next to ensure consistency of information and avoid having individuals at each level repeat the process of tracking down PIO information. This person could communicate with departments at the earlier review stages to make sure they are making necessary updates in CurricUNET.

A member of the Executive Staff gave the following input about the prioritization process:

When the exec team prioritizes the “Top 50,” we have used a system that involves picking an equal percentage from each area. This is a huge time commitment for both Student Services and Academic Affairs! We then, as an executive team vote on the top 50 from all that have been brought forward. The actual “voting” and ranking provides an uneven representation due to our organization (VPs and AVPS who report to one area are able to effectively have more votes) however, the team has been able to “vote”
on these PIOs in a manner that holds the overall college view. The results have been admirable but it remains hard for me to justify the time commitment.

Round 5: Survey based on the WASC Rubric for Effectiveness in Planning and Program Review

Of the 19 members of the committee, 15 completed the survey by the deadline. The survey results are attached.

There were two anomalies in the responses. First, one person responded “Strongly Disagree” to all questions. Given the way the rest of the responses, this seems to be unusual. Second, one person apparently skipped all the questions. Since the survey was anonymous, it is difficult to ascertain what happened in these two instances.

PAC Review Meeting, Friday, May 11, 2012

All of the assessment input received was reviewed and discussed. There was consensus that the assessment indicates we are doing very well with our Planning and Program Review processes. However, the Program Improvement Objective process, especially the PIO Prioritization for Resource Allocation process, needs significant review for improvement.

PAC members were asked to specifically review the input received from Round 4 of the assessment process in preparation for a follow up PAC meeting. The follow up meeting was sent for May 30, 2012.

PAC Review Meeting, May 30, 2012

Extensive dialogue took place and resulted in a set of preliminary suggestions for improving the process of linking Program Improvement Objectives from Program Reviews with the budget development and resource allocation processes.

The following is a summary of those suggestions:

2008 Commission Recommendation
Codify the links between Program Review, budget decision-making, facilities planning, and information technology decisions that support student learning outcomes.

Change the name from PIO Resource Allocation Process to PIO Categorization Process

Deans and Directors provide stewardship of the PIO’s in their respective Department/Divisions.
College Council identifies and communicates College Annual Priorities prior to PIO annual updates and development. Example priorities: Budget, Accreditation and Measure G Bond Projects

Department/Division ranks Department PIO’s using a global criterion that links to annual college wide priorities. Example: Level 1 – *College wide*  Level 2 – *Cross department/area*  Level 3 – *Departmental*

Create a college wide master list of all PIO’s for each ranked level

Create a Resource Allocation Process that assigns available resources to PIOs. If resources are available within the department, this would be noted in the Resource Column next to the PIO and Action Plan.

Involves the Resource Allocation Team (RAT) once the department PIO is identified. Academic Deans and Directors would meet with appropriate RAT members to identify estimated costs related to PIO’s which require budget beyond current department/division allocations, new technology request, and/or facility modifications etc. The deans would complete a form based on this meeting.

Discontinue multiyear action plan process and consolidate into PIO annual action plan and assessment process.

Action plans requiring more than a year would be separated into annual chunks.

Create a process for adding urgent and/or midyear PIO’s

Document the method and criteria for adding college-wide PIOs.

Discontinue the PIO Committee.

**Summary of proposed PIO Categorization Process (modified 5-30-2012)**

- College Annual Priorities Identified and Communicated
- Presented as information item to the Board by July 31
- Budget Committee identifies available funding sources by May 15
- College Wide Master List of PIO Prioritized by Level
- President, VP’s and AVP’s, add College Wide PIO’s
- Deans and Directors Prioritize PIO’s for Departments/Divisions. Identifies PIO’s that have resources available within department budgets. As needed meets with Resource Allocation Team (RAT) to determine estimated costs for staff, technology, and/or facilities, etc.
- Departments Rank PIO’s using global criteria
- Annual Program Review updates July-December
The members of PAC presented an interim report of the strategies used to conduct an assessment of the College’s Planning and Program Review processes. There was general consensus that the Planning and Program Review processes were in good shape. But there was also general consensus that the process of linking PIOs to budget development and resource allocation was too cumbersome and needs to be streamlined and simplified. It was decided that PAC would meet again before the July 16, 2012 College Council meeting to further refine the suggestions for improvement of the PIO processes and report back at that meeting. The goal for PAC is to have a final assessment report and recommendations ready to present to the College Council at the August 22, 2012 retreat during Learning College Week.

Executive Staff Review, Tuesday, June 26, 2012

In preparation for the July 11, 2012 PAC meeting the President asked the Executive Staff to review all of the assessment input to date. A good dialogue ensued and several themes emerged:

- Integrate PIOs from Program Review more fully into budget development and resource allocation by making them a formal item of review at the annual Budget Manager Meetings (need to identify the timeline for these meeting and the fit with the budget development timeline) with the Vice President of Administrative Services as the budget for a subsequent year is being developed.
- Develop a consistent agenda for the Budget Manager Meetings and a rubric for assessing PIOs for possible funding in the budget.
- Prior to the Budget Manager Meetings, Budget Managers will work with VP and AVPs to categorize PIOs into the levels describe in the May 30 recommendations.
- VPs/AVPs will assist managers in developing PIOs directly from Program reviews and document this process.
- The VPAS will document results of the Budget Manager Meetings and communicate the results to the Budget Committee as the budget development process unfolds.
- The Budget Committee will be more focused on linking PIOs to budget development.
- The Mini-Grant process will be coordinated by a group other than the Budget Committee, possibly a task group of College Council.

The dialogue will continue at the July 10, 2012 Executive Staff meeting.

Executive Staff Review, Tuesday, July 10, 2012

The Executive Staff reviewed all assessment information generated to date and created a draft list of recommendations to eventually be proposed at the August 22, 2012 College Council Retreat. The draft list of recommendations, along with a revised Annual Planning Chart will be discussed by PAC at its Wednesday, July 11, 2012 meeting.

PAC Review Meeting, Wednesday, July 11, 2012

The draft list of recommendations, along with the revised Annual Planning Chart generated by the Executive Staff was reviewed and several refinements were developed. The recommendations will be presented to the College Council at its Monday, July 16, 2012 meeting.

The recommendations are as follows:

In general, the assessment by the President’s Process Assessment Committee (PAC) indicated we are doing very well with our Planning and Program Review processes.
However, the Program Improvement Objective process, especially the PIO Prioritization for Resource Allocation process, needs significant review for improvement. After considerable review and dialogue, the PAC is presenting to the President and College Council the following recommendations for improvement.

- Change the name from PIO Resource Allocation Process to PIO Budget Linkage Process.
- The President and the College Council identify and communicate College Annual Priorities prior to the annual fall Program Review updates and development. Examples: Budget, Accreditation and Measure G.
- All Program Reviews and PIOs will be updated annually during the fall semester.
- All Program Reviews will be reviewed and approved by the end of the fall semester each year. Program Review Approvers will use common guidelines for assessing Program Reviews. Attached are the guidelines that have been developed for Academic Affairs. Student Services and Administrative Services, and the President’s Office will be developing similar guidelines. These guidelines will also be helpful to Program Review Originators as they engage in ongoing updates to their reviews.
- Discontinue multi-year action plan process and consolidate into PIO annual action plan and assessment process. Action plans requiring more than a year would be separated into annual pieces.
- Deans and Directors, working closely with faculty and staff, provide stewardship of the PIO’s in their respective Department/Divisions.
- We will move away from the college-wide ranking process to an approach that more fully integrates PIOs from Program Review into budget development and resource allocation at the Department/Program level.
- Department/Programs will categorize each PIO into one of three general areas:
  1 – College wide  2 – Cross Division/Department  3 – Departmental
  These areas will be more fully defined before these recommendations are finalized.
  It is important to state that this categorization is not meant to differentiate between PIOs for funding purposes. The major purpose is to inform the President and the College Council of how the total list of PIOs can be viewed in these general areas for planning purposes.
- Create a college wide master list of all PIO’s by each of the three category areas.
- Make PIOs a formal item for review at the annual Budget Manager Meetings with the Vice President of Administrative Services as the budget for a subsequent year is being developed. This would normally take place in the February – April time period.
- Develop a consistent agenda for the Budget Manager Meetings and a rubric for assessing PIOs for possible funding in the budget. A list of topics and questions for these meetings is under development and should be completed before the recommendations are finalized. An important focus of these meetings will be on how existing budget resources can be used to meet PIO needs.
- The VPAS will document results of the Budget Manager Meetings and communicate the results to the Budget Committee as the budget development process unfolds.
- The Budget Committee will be more focused on linking PIOs to budget development.
- The Mini-Grant process will no longer be coordinated by the Budget Committee. The President will work with the Executive Director of the Foundation to assess the past two rounds of Mini-Grants and explore the future process for Mini-Grant awards.
- Create a process for adding urgent and/or midyear PIOs.
- Change the terminology of, “college-wide PIOs” to Institutional Improvement Objectives (IIOs) and document the method and criteria for adding them to the annual planning process.
- Discontinue the PIO Committee.
- Revise the Annual Planning Timeline (attached)

Review by Executive Staff August 14, 2012

Clarified remaining questions regarding “categorization” of PIOs and nature of Budget Manager Meetings
In general, the assessment by the President’s Process Assessment Committee (PAC) indicated we are doing very well with our Planning and Program Review processes.

However, the Program Improvement Objective process, especially the PIO Prioritization for Resource Allocation process, needs significant review for improvement. After considerable review and dialogue, the PAC is presenting to the President and College Council the following recommendations for improvement.

- Change the name from “PIO Prioritization for Resource Allocation Process” to “Linking PIOs to Planning and Resource Allocation.”

Recommendations for the Annual Planning process:

- All Program Reviews and PIOs will be updated annually during the fall semester.
- The President and College Council will identify and communicate annual focus areas from the College Strategic Plan, and other overarching priorities, prior to the annual fall Program Review updates. Example priorities: Budget, Accreditation and Measure G Bond Projects.
- All Program Reviews will be reviewed and approved by the end of the fall semester each year. Program Review Approvers will use common guidelines for assessing Program Reviews. Attached are the guidelines that have been developed for Academic Affairs. Student Services and Administrative Services, and the President’s Office will be developing similar guidelines. These guidelines will also be helpful to Program Review writers.
- Discontinue multi-year action plan process and use an annual PIO action plan and assessment process. Action plans requiring more than a year would be separated into annual pieces.
- Deans and Directors, working closely with faculty and staff, provide stewardship of the PIO’s in their respective Department/Divisions, particularly during the Program Review approval process.
- We will move away from the college-wide ranking process to an approach that more fully integrates PIOs from Program Review into budget development and resource allocation at the Department/Program level. Change the terminology of, “college-wide PIOs” to Institutional Improvement Objectives (IIOs), as defined by the President, and document the method and criteria for adding them to the annual planning process.
- The Executive Staff will categorize each PIO into one of three general areas for planning purposes. It is important to state that this categorization is not meant to differentiate between PIOs for funding purposes. The major purpose is to inform the President and the College Council of how the total list of PIOs can be viewed in these general areas for planning purposes.

1 - Institution wide
   - Risk mitigations
   - Compliance
   - Continued operation of the college
   - Achievement of strategic objectives
   - Annual focus of the College Strategic Plan, as defined by the President, including Institutional Improvement Objectives
2 - Cross Division/Department
   o Operational Efficiencies, including staffing arrangements, work processes, etc…
   o Creating synergies between Divisions/Departments

3 - Departmental
   o Self-contained, localized to a single department

- Create a college wide master list of all PIO’s by the three category areas for the President and the College Council for planning purposes.

Linkage to resource allocation:

- Institutionalize the annual Budget Manager Meetings with the Vice President of Administrative Services as a formal part of the budget development process.
- Make PIOs a formal item for review at the annual Budget Manager Meetings with the Vice President of Administrative Services as the budget for a subsequent year is being developed. This would normally take place in the February – April time period.
- Develop a consistent agenda for the Budget Manager Meetings including possible PIO related questions for the Budget Manager Meetings:
  1. How do you anticipate your programmatic needs changing in the coming year and how effective is your current budget in meeting those needs?
  2. How might existing budget allocations be used to support the PIOs?
  3. How would you demonstrate or measure that this PIO would be an **effective** use of District resources (e.g.- Outcomes/$ Invested; or, ROI and cost benefit)?
  4. How would you demonstrate or measure that this PIO would be an **efficient** use of District resources (e.g.- Outcomes/ # of Students Impacted)?
  5. How does this PIO leverage the use of District resources and/or assets?
  6. What do research-based data indicate with respect to anticipated outcomes as a result of District resources being applied in a manner consistent with this PIO?
  7. Does this PIO require a one-time or ongoing infusion of District resources to be successful? To what degree?
- The VPAS will document results of the Budget Manager Meetings and communicate the results to the Budget Committee as the budget development process unfolds.
- The Budget Committee will be more focused on linking PIOs to budget development.
- The Mini-Grant process will no longer be coordinated by the Budget Committee. The President will work with the Executive Director of the Foundation to assess the past two rounds of Mini-Grants and explore the future process for Mini-Grant awards.
- Create a process for adding urgent and/or midyear PIOs.
- Discontinue the PIO Committee.

Revise the Annual Planning Timeline based on these recommendations (attached)