

**Final Assessment
College of San Mateo's 2008-2013 Planning Cycle**

I. Overview/Executive Summary

As a result of recommendations made by ACCJC in 2007 to improve its institutional planning processes, College of San Mateo (CSM) implemented a new integrated planning model in 2008. The model was organized by planning cycles that align with the 6-year accreditation cycle. As a result, the College has now completed its first cycle of institutional planning, spanning the period 2008 – 2013.

This report highlights the major accomplishments and findings of the first planning cycle and its impact on institutional effectiveness. As described here, the College has conducted a variety of ongoing and summative assessments that resulted in improvements to the planning structure, processes, and evaluation tools, and ultimately in the creation of new interventions and programs which improve student success. These assessments of its planning processes ensure sustainable, continuous quality improvement of the planning system at CSM.

II. Background

The Institutional Planning and Budgeting Committee (IBPC) has overarching stewardship for the ongoing implementation and assessment of College of San Mateo's institutional planning process. It also ensures that relevant segments from the program-level planning cycle, particularly SLO assessment, analysis of student achievement outcomes, and the trends and themes from program review, are integrated into the College's institutional planning.

The Institutional Planning and Budgeting Committee was established in 2008, originally as the Institutional Planning Committee (IPC); its current name was adopted in 2013. The membership is deliberately broad based so that representatives from all constituencies – faculty, classified staff, students and administration have genuine, direct input into participatory planning and decision making. Its mission is to “ensure the implementation and ongoing assessment of the institutional planning process.”

In order to meet its mission, IPBC has established an on-going, self-reflective dialog regarding the College's planning processes. In addition, IPBC has established a robust website which includes committee membership, meeting agendas and minutes, and various planning documents.

IPBC accomplishes its mission by:

- Developing institutional priorities based on the SMCCCD Strategic Plan and the CSM Educational Master Plan.
- Ensuring that budget allocations are based on institutional planning priorities and are relevant to the current fiscal environment.
- Establishing measurable indicators for institutional priorities based on recommendations from the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), establishing targets for those indicators, and monitoring progress in meeting those targets.
- Recommending institutional priorities to College Council.
- Ensuring the integration of the planning process, including, but not limited to a coordinated, institutional approach in addressing college priorities and the interrelationship among institutional plans.
- Establishing regular communication with the campus community regarding the institutional planning process.
- Assessing on an annual basis the effectiveness of the Institutional Planning Committee and the institutional planning process.

Components of Integrated Planning: Integration of the College's institutional planning is a key component of institutional planning and accomplished in several ways:

- **Structural:** All key constituents are members of IPBC, including all institutional planning committee chairs/co-chairs, chairs of all Academic Senate Committees, and district representatives.
- **Institutional Plans** are aligned and synchronized with a master planning cycle organized by the six (6) year accreditation cycle.
- **Institutional Plans** are aligned using a standard template.
- **Institutional Plans** must contain goals that directly address the College's Institutional Priorities, Mission Statement, and other key overarching plans. Goals are aligned with quantitative measures that comprise the College Index.
- **College Index** is a standardized "report card" of indicators that are tied directly to the College's Institutional Priorities and measure progress in addressing priorities.
- **Program Planning Decisions:** Program Review addresses data (e.g. College Index and SLO achievement), Mission, and Institutional Priorities which results in program-level resource allocation.

- **Other resource allocations** (e.g. initiatives supported by IBPC) consider data, Mission Statement, and Institutional Priorities.

III. College Index: 2008/2009 - 2013/2014

Note: See Appendix B, “Analysis of College Index Outcomes,” for College Index trend data and an inventory of programmatic outcomes that resulted.

In 2009/2010, College of San Mateo developed the [College Index](#), a compilation of performance indicators linked to the College’s Institutional Priorities. The College Index was initially comprised of 53 indicators, reflecting the most common indicators used by comprehensive Community Colleges at the national and statewide level. These include indicators and measures of institutional performance by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office, including DataMart, ARCC, and Matriculation Reporting as well as locally defined measures. The majority of indicators were populated with 2008-09 baseline data. Modest targets for each indicator have been established annually and approved by IPBC.

Currently, the College Index is comprised of 43 indicators and contains four years of data (2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12, and 2012/13). Each year contains a measure of the +/- change from the College baseline year and a target for the forthcoming year. For example, the 2012/13 College Index has targets for 2013/14.

IPBC uses targets to establish “goals” which the College is aspiring to meet. IPBC, along with other college entities, examine these targets in relation to the initial baseline data as well as year-to-year “actual” performance of the College on each indicator. In some cases, the College has not met the established targets as a result of external environmental factors. For example, the target for the number of CSU transfers was not met because of CSU budgetary reductions which severely reduced the number of community college transfers accommodated at our two primary CSU transfer campuses, SFSU and SJSU.

IPBC has systematically assessed the utility of the College Index as it has examined these targets. The initial version identified 120 indicators for possible use in a “Comprehensive College Index.” This number was judged to be too complex and not easily accessible for the community at large. By 2010, IPBC had identified 58 indicators. By 2010-11, data for three years was available for most indicators that enabled the College to develop more refined targets. In Fall 2012/2013, upon further review of the index, IPBC determined that data for some indicators was difficult to obtain, not available, or yielded little meaningful data about the institution. As a result, these indicators have been eliminated. To complete the 2008-2013 cycle, IPBC analyzed the index in December 2013 and set new targets for 2013-2014.

IV. Status of Institutional Plans

Summary: All institutional plans, which were developed for the 2009-2013 planning cycle, have been implemented. The institutional plans for this period mirror the committee structure in place for this cycle. The final reports on the status of the plans for this planning cycle, 2009-2013, were provided to IPBC in Fall 2013 during presentations by the associated committee chairs. (Reports are posted [online](#).)

Background: As part of the integrated planning effort coordinated by IPBC, five institutional planning committees were initially established by IPBC. (See Planning Committee [webpages](#).) They included the Budget Planning Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Human Resources Committee, Distance Education Committee, and Technology Committee. The Diversity in Action Group (DIAG), an ad hoc committee at the College was subsequently included as an institutional planning committee. Each committee was comprised of representatives from each of the four constituencies, including a representative from the District Office to ensure that college planning is aligned with district planning. Each committee was responsible for the development of institutional plans which included: Budget Planning Committee Plan, Diversity in Action Group Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Human Resources Plan, Distance Education Plan, and Technology Plan.

Each committee developed a three-year plan using a standard template that included plan goals, objectives and action steps. The goals, objectives and action steps are aligned with the College's Mission Statement, Institutional Priorities, and related College Index indicators. The major accomplishments during the reporting period are identified below. Objectives and action items that are carried over to the next cycle are included in Section VI of this report, "Implications for the Next Planning Cycle."

Budget Planning Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. Three of the four Budget Planning Committee goals were accomplished. Given the fiscal climate during this planning cycle, this is commendatory. The fourth goal, "Develop and implement a comprehensive institutional advancement plan to include strategies for fundraising and external grants development" was not completed due to budget constraints. This goal will be carried forward in the next planning cycle.
2. The Budget Planning Committee coordinated with the Technology Committee to identify and prioritize equipment and technology needs.
3. To gauge transparency of the Budget Planning Committee's decisions and decision-making processes, a survey was administered to all CSM employees. The Spring 2012

Campus Climate and Satisfaction surveys conducted of all employees concluded that 82% of staff and 68.5% of faculty believe that “All constituencies have adequate opportunity to participate in the development of financial plans and budgets.” Also, 79.4% of classified staff and 74.5% of faculty believe that, “Appropriate and timely information is provided regularly throughout CSM.”

Diversity in Action Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. DIAG produced a report titled, “[Assessment of the CSM Student Achievement/Equity Gap](#)” in March of 2013. The report includes a review and assessment of student success data across various demographic groups and identified the achievement gaps to be among African American and Pacific Islander students. The analysis of institutional data and this report resulted in an IPBC decision to establish an Umoja Program.
2. DIAG has established a satisfaction survey that is administered at all attendees at DIAG sponsored events. The results are submitted to DIAG for review and tabulation. This information provides valuable information for DIAG in terms of future event planning.

Distance Education Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. Evaluation of distance education courses is integrated into program review. The Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness annually provides student success reports containing delivery-mode course-comparison data (distance vs. face-to-face mode). These student achievement reports span the period, Fall 2005-Fall 2012, and are available [online](#). In addition, new program review guidelines for the Spring 2014 cycle explicitly address student achievement in distance education modes.
2. To address professional development needs, a new [Distance Education Center](#) has been established. An Instructional Designer has been hired and provides faculty and instructional and student service staff with one-on-one support and group workshops. The District Distance Education Committee continues to explore options to increase and improve professional development options.
3. Comprehensive information is communicated to the College community about the range of programs and services available to distance learners. The presence of a Distance Education Center, prominent inclusion in the Schedule of Classes and on web pages, presentations at division and college-level meetings all provide evidence of on-going support of distance education.

Enrollment Management Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. The Committee endorsed several key initiatives to address enrollment and success data, including the re-establishment of the [Puente Program](#), implementation of Math Boost, a pilot supplemental instruction program to increase the success of students in basic mathematics courses, and partnerships with student services, particularly counseling and instructional programs, to provide more focus on transfer opportunities for students.
2. The Committee examined course-scheduling patterns to determine impact on student's time to degree. The budget crisis, which occurred during this planning cycle, required the College to eliminate certain course offerings. Thus, it was important to monitor this so as not to adversely impact students' ability to complete required courses.
3. In coordination with Community Relations and Marketing, the College operationalized a number of marketing, recruitment and outreach activities, including the development of a centralized calendar for all marketing activities and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of outreach strategies.

Human Resources Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. To ensure parity across hiring procedures, the committee reviewed with District Human Resources (1) the communication of hiring criteria, (2) their evaluation qualifications and procedures, (3) their procedures to publicize opening, (4) sample job announcements, and (5) their process to evaluate the effectiveness of the hiring procedures.
2. To develop a forecast of the College human resources needs as a basis for recommendations to IPBC, the committee determined the current staffing levels of classified, instructional, and administrative staff by extracting and gathering information (1) from program reviews, (2) from the deans' and administration's assessments of anticipated areas of growth or decline, and (3) from the Educational Master Plan.
3. After identification and analysis, the committee identified and analyzed professional and staff development needs across the campus and recommended professional and staff development opportunities.

4. The committee proposed that a college-wide professional development and staff development coordinator be selected to plan and organize professional development activities (including flex) for all college personnel.

Technology Committee/Major Accomplishments:

1. Based upon recommendations in the plan, the College's computer and peripheral equipment has been systematically inventoried; the inventory, for example, has informed a long-range replacement schedule for lab computers and printers, completed through collaboration with Information Technology Services and CSM's instructional administrators and Vice President of Instruction.
2. A technology renewal fund has been set-aside to secure technology funding for five years.
3. IBPC reviews significant technology equipment requests with an eye to reducing redundancies.
4. To support distance education and the use of educational technologies, CSM has hired an Instructional Designer who provides one-on-one training as well as workshops; the library has also provided training in Web 2.0 for faculty and staff.

V. Status of College Initiatives and Key Institutional Decisions

As the overarching body for institutional planning and effectiveness, IBPC has approved a number of college-wide initiatives which are summarized below. Each of these initiatives and programs were established in response to a specific trigger/data source, particularly the Educational Master Plan, its Information Update, 2012, and other institutional data. Several of the initiatives have become institutionalized at the College, while others are pending implementation. For additional decision-making detail, see Appendix B, "Decision Matrix, Key College Initiatives, 2007-2013."

- Established Math Boost
- Supported Supplemental Instruction Pilot (funded through BSI)
- Established Honors Project Pilot
- Re-established the Puente Program
- Expanded Distance Education program infrastructure
- Established comprehensive learning center
- Built capacity of research and planning infrastructure

Pending Institutionalization:

- Supplemental Instruction (endorsed by IPBC, December, 2013)
- Umoja Project (endorsed by IPBC, December, 2013)
- Mana Project

VI. Implications for Next Planning Cycle

Modify integrated planning cycle: There was some confusion about the extent to which CSM had conducted assessment of the planning cycle, as the site team visit overlapped with the final semester of assessment. In order to complete the institutional planning cycle prior to the accreditation site visit, IPBC will modify the planning calendar timeline to reflect that the “close out” of the cycle is to be completed in the spring prior to the accreditation visit. (*Note:* Assessments have occurred throughout the cycle, not solely as a summative conclusion of the cycle which is represented by this report.)

Timeline: January 2014

Review of IPBC Mission: Effective Fall 2013, the charge of IPBC has expanded to include budget oversight responsibilities. Initial committee discussions have resulted in a variety of approaches for incorporating this function into IPBC’s purpose and scope of responsibility. One approach may be the establishment of a small work group/subcommittee that would work closely with the new vice president of administrative services and budget officer to provide budget information to IPBC at regular intervals throughout the year. Processes established by the former Budget Planning Committee, including the four-phase budget process, may be incorporated.

Timeline: February 2014

Increase communication with college community about planning and decision-making: The Planning and Decision Making Manual will be distributed college wide. This manual documents the established planning and decision-making processes at the college.

Timeline: Spring 2014

Implement new template for institutional initiatives: A draft template to be used for new initiatives will be shared with the college community in early Spring 2014. This will ensure that members of the college community know how to submit proposals and that there is consistency in the proposal information submitted to IPBC. IPBC will also finalize a companion evaluation instrument for assessing the success of initiatives that have been approved.

Timeline: January 2014

Develop new Institutional Plans: With the elimination or merging of several of the original institutional planning committees, there now exist three institutional committees: Diversity in Action Committee, Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee, and the Basic Skills Initiative Committee. In addition, IPBC will continue discussions in early Spring 2014 regarding the process for integrating the budget function into its charge. A subcommittee may be recommended. These institutional planning committees will establish new institutional plans with a three-year horizon (2013-2016). Any goals, objectives, and action steps from the first planning cycle that were not accomplished and have been determined still to be relevant will be incorporated into the next institutional plan cycle. For example, the former Budget Planning Committee was unable to complete a goal aimed at establishing an institutional advancement plan to include strategies for fundraising and external grants development. This goal was not able to be accomplished due to the budget crisis; it will be included in the next planning cycle.

Timeline: February 2014

VII. Assessment of the Institutional Planning Process

Since its establishment as the institutional committee with oversight and stewardship of the college's integrated planning, IPBC has continually assessed its planning structure and processes, using a variety of institutional data which have resulted in improvements in the planning structure, processes, and evaluation tools. Over the course of the 2008-2013 planning cycle a number of structural and procedural changes have taken place to improve effectiveness of the planning process. These are organized and described below as structural changes and process changes.

Structural Changes to Enable Assessment

Institutional Planning Committees:

As part of the integrated planning effort coordinated by IPBC, five institutional planning committees were initially established. They included the Budget Planning Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, Human Resources Committee, Distance Education Committee, and Technology Committee. The Diversity in Action Group (DIAG), an ad hoc committee at the college was subsequently included as an institutional planning committee. In addition, effective November 2013, the Basic Skills Initiative Committee, (BSI), was established as an additional institutional planning committee.

Each committee is comprised of representatives from each of the four constituencies, including a representative from the District Office to ensure that college planning is aligned with district

planning. Committees were responsible for developing a three-year plan using a standard template that included plan goals, objectives, and action steps. The goals, objectives and action steps are aligned with the College's Mission Statement and Institutional Priorities. Summary status reports of the institutional plans were provided to IPBC in fall, 2011 and fall, 2013.

Early in the planning cycle, it became apparent that changes in the committee structure were warranted, particularly to reduce duplication of effort and create greater efficiency and alignment among committees. The following changes were made:

- **The Enrollment Management Committee (EMC)** was repurposed as a standing task force of IPBC with a revised purpose and function. The task force will carry out any number of identified college wide activities and initiatives. Task force membership will include members of IPBC and other members of the college community, as appropriate, based on the particular assignment or initiative with which the task force is charged. During this reporting cycle two task forces were established (the Math Task Force and the Student Engagement Task Force) with representation from IPBC and members of the college community.
 - **Outcome:** EMC is functioning more effectively as a standing task force. Other functions, previously assigned to EMC have been reassigned. For example, setting college load and FTES targets is accomplished through the College's budgeting process. Other enrollment management activities related to public relations, marketing, college branding, relations with high schools, and student recruitment are fully institutionalized within the operations of CSM's Office of Community Relations & Marketing.
- **The Human Resources Committee has been disbanded.** An assessment of the Human Resource Committee found that comprehensive employee information is contained in the Education Master Plan, including demographic information regarding all employee groups, that assists the College in determining appropriate staffing levels and anticipating retirements. In addition, there is a well-established process for hiring faculty, which begins with the identification of needed positions in program review, and the approval of the specific number of faculty positions to fill each year. Professional development needs are coordinated by other individuals and committees at the College. Finally, a revised process for hiring classified positions has been developed by IPBC. The new process, which relies on classified requests from program review and college initiatives, has enabled the College to establish a more long range classified staffing plan.

- **Outcome:** An assessment of the purpose and function of the Human Resource Committee revealed duplication of effort. As noted, institutional data on college employees already exists, there is coordination with the District's Human Resources department for the recruitment of new faculty and staff positions, and processes for identifying new faculty positions are well established.
- **The Technology Committee has merged with a newly established Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC).** The original mission of the original Technology Committee was to ensure that the college provides and maintains adequate technological resources to support student learning in accordance with what were, at the time, the College's Strategic Plan, Strategic Priorities, and annual College Goals. Technology Committee assessments determined that replacement of computer equipment and peripherals is well coordinated between the District Information Technology Department and college personnel and does not need to be the purview of an institutional committee. In addition, the District has allocated remaining bond funds to the college for the next five years which results in a robust sustainability plan for equipment and technology needs. These needs are more appropriately identified and prioritized at the college level by the instructional and student services administrators rather than a committee. Lastly, it became clear that there needed to be greater integration between the originally established Distance Education and Technology Committees in order to identify trends in the delivery of educational technology. As a result, a new Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC) was established in spring, 2013 with a new mission and purpose.
 - **Outcome:**

Long-term planning for technology is appropriately operationalized through College, District, and District's Information Technology Services collaboration, rather than under the umbrella of a college committee. College faculty and staff need to have key advisory roles in identifying trends in educational technologies and providing expertise about learning and programmatic applications; DEETC provides the appropriate advisory forum for shaping not only a continued vision for distance education, but other uses of educational technology.
- **The Budget Planning Committee has merged with the Institutional Planning Committee:** The mission and purpose of the Budget Planning Committee (BPC) has changed over time. Most notably, the majority of decision-making now resides with

IPBC. As a result, BPC activities over the last two years have been limited to a review of the budget at various intervals throughout the year. Members of BPC concluded that these functions could be carried out by IPBC and greater integration of planning and budgeting could be accomplished if the committees merged. The committee began operating as the Institutional Planning and Budgeting Committee (IPBC) in the 2013/14 academic year. Additional discussion has been scheduled for spring, 2014 to determine the process for budget integration with IPBC. Also, to provide greater oversight for the operational budget and develop long term budget forecasting, a new vice president of administrative services position has been approved. This administrator, who will begin work in January 2014 will serve as a member of the District's Budget Committee and President's Cabinet. This administrator's participation in key district and college budget oversight groups will ensure that the College is represented during district-wide budget discussions, including plans for a new allocation model within the district; it will also ensure that the college budget is closely and regularly monitored by the executive leadership at the College to ensure fiscal accountability and integrity.

- **Outcome:** While the merge of the two committees has only recently taken place, it is anticipated that greater integration between the planning and budgeting processes will result.
- **Revised Mission and Purpose of College Council/New Role in Planning Structure**
College Council (CC) has its well-regarded roots dating back to 1993 as foundation for the implementation of shared governance at CSM; the original vision included the hope that shared governance would eventually permeate the institution beyond College Council. CC included a Budget Subcommittee.

In response to accreditation issues, IPBC emerged over the last several years with planning oversight for the "Integrated Planning Model" and as the body that ensures the integration of institutional planning. An in-depth focus group activity with members of College Council identified some confusion about College Council's role in the planning structure as well as redundancy of function in relation to IPBC. Subsequent meetings of College Council focused on discussing what might be the revised mission and purpose of College Council. When initially established in 1993, after the passage of AB 1725, College Council served to ensure that participatory governance was taking place throughout the institution. Because participatory governance is now fully integrated at all levels within the college and constituent groups are represented on all institutional committees, the

original mission and purpose of College Council has largely been achieved and a new mission and purpose is needed.

- **Outcome:** The mission and purpose of IPBC and College Council have been clarified and revised to better reflect the changes in responsibility and oversight for institutional planning and governance. College Council's renewed focus as a steward of participatory governance will address some concerns suggested through the focus group and in employee Campus Climate and Satisfaction surveys about the need for improved communication around planning, participatory governance, and transparency of decision-making.
- **Membership on IPBC**

At the time IPBC (formerly IPC) was established, the chairs of each of the Institutional Planning Committees and other members of the college community, by virtue of their position at the college, were appointed to IPBC. An unexpected consequence was that the majority of the chairpersons of the institutional planning committees were administrators or faculty; there were no classified chairpersons. In response to concerns about the imbalance in representation from constituent groups, three additional classified staff were appointed to IPBC. In addition, it was recommended that the institutional planning committees appoint co-chairs, ideally to include a classified staff member or a student, to ensure greater representation of all constituencies on IPBC.

 - **Outcome:** This revised structure has resulted in greater participation and communication of the planning process among all constituents.
- **Term Limits for Members of IPBC**

In order to ensure increasing participation by members of the college community on IPBC the committee adopted three-year terms for all institutional planning committee members. Co-chairs of institutional planning committees serve two-year terms with the opportunity to serve a second, two-year term in order to provide continuity on the planning committees as committee members rotate off the committee.

 - **Outcome:** This rotation will take place in 2014.

Process Changes to Enable Assessment

- ***Use of Surveys***

In order to continually evaluate the effectiveness of the institutional planning process, the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) conducts employee Campus Climate and Satisfaction surveys that include questions regarding the college's planning processes, governance, leadership, and decision-making. Findings are available online for [2010, 2011, and 2012](#). In addition, short surveys administered to key institutional governance committees and other participants in planning have been administered in order to gauge participants knowledge of the institutional planning process. Findings are also available [online](#).

- ***Outcome:*** CSM has developed useful climate survey instruments, tailored to staff as one cohort and faculty and administrators as another, which probe at employees' attitudes toward planning in multiple ways. As companion data, the brief surveys serve as temperature gauges of participants active in planning. Multiple years of data have chronicled CSM's improvement in many areas related to planning and have identified areas for continued attention, including increased communication around planning and decision-making.

- ***Formal Review of Educational Master Plan and its Updates***

IPBC has developed a formal process for reviewing College of San Mateo's Educational Master Plan (EMP) and significant updates to it (e.g. [Educational Master Plan: Information Update, 2012](#)). This process ensures that all members of IPBC are familiar with understanding and interpreting key institutional data. The first review occurred in fall, 2012. Staff from the Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness Office (PRIE) provided training in using and understanding institutional data. The committee then worked in subgroups to analyze sections of the EMP and report their findings to the larger group. As a result of this activity, IPBC developed a number of key initiatives on which to focus during the 2012-13 academic year. This formal review process will be conducted with each update of the EMP, conducted every three years.

- ***Outcome:*** The EMP review process has resulted in greater understanding in interpreting and using institutional data in the decision making process. IPBC meetings regularly include committee discussion of institutional data. Institutional planning and decision making is evidence based. As an example, a review and analysis of institutional data resulted in the committee's recent

endorsement of an Umoja Project and the institutionalization of supplemental instruction.

- ***Development and Ongoing Assessment of Institutional Priorities***

College of San Mateo developed and adopted five (5) [Institutional Priorities](#) that serve as the strategic plan for the college and enable the College to meet its stated mission. As part of the Educational Master Plan review, IPBC reviews the Institutional Priorities every three years. While the priorities may not change, the specific objectives for each priority may change from year to year. The most recent review of the Institutional Priorities and objectives took place at a IPBC meetings in November 2013. Changes and additions were made based on analysis of institutional data and the most recent student [Campus Climate and Satisfaction Survey](#) (2013) results. The most recent changes will be vetted with the college community in Spring 2014.

- ***Outcome:*** The systematic review of the Institutional Priorities ensures that they continue to be aligned with the college's Mission Statement. It also ensures that Institutional Priorities accurately reflect the most current data and information about the college community, the diverse populations it serves, and the needs of the external community.

- ***Development of a Planning Manual***

Under direction of the college president, the College has prepared a comprehensive *College of San Mateo Planning and Decision Making Manual (Planning Manual)*. A draft of the *Planning Manual* has been distributed to the college community for feedback. The *Planning Manual* was developed in response to Faculty and Staff satisfaction surveys regarding the participatory governance process. Based upon the survey responses the college president and members of IPBC (formerly IPC) have concluded that the College should improve documentation of planning systems. The process of developing the *Planning Manual* has been beneficial because it has required the College to review and document all its planning systems at a detail level.

- ***Outcome:*** It is anticipated that higher levels of understanding about governance and decision making processes will be reported by all constituents in the next cycle of employee Campus Climate and Satisfaction surveys.

- **Program Review Process**

The Academic Senate has assessed the College's program review process and made substantial changes to program review as a result of the Commission's 2007 action letter. Specifically, the Academic Senate has modified its program review process to fully meet accreditation standards, and has also relied on ACCJC guidelines in designing a new program review process. The new program review process was piloted in 2008. After implementing the process, the Academic Senate administered a survey to faculty in spring 2010 to collect feedback on the new program review model. In Spring 2012 the Academic Senate conducted focus group sessions to gather qualitative feedback on the College's program review processes. Several changes have been made to the college's program review process as a result of these two assessment activities. Most notably, the revision to program review now reflects the need to integrate program student learning outcomes and assessment into the institutional planning process. See [Program Review website](#).

At the March 26, 2013 Academic Senate meeting, the Governing Council of the Academic Senate passed the following resolution:

To better inform college planning processes and decision-making, specifically with regard to student learning and program planning, the Academic Senate of the College of San Mateo recommends that faculty and others involved in completing program review identify program review themes and trends to be incorporated into institutional planning processes.

—Academic Senate, College of San Mateo

- **Outcome:** Continued improvements to the program review process ensure that resource allocation and program improvements are appropriately aligned with the college Mission, SLO's assessment, Institutional Priorities, findings from the Educational Master Plan, and a variety of program data about student achievement and other pertinent areas.

- **IPBC Assessment of Program Reviews Reports**

At the time IPBC was first established (as IPC), the staff from the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness provided bound copies of all program reviews to members of IPBC. Committee members were responsible for reviewing the program review reports and providing feedback. Given the significant number of program reviews (approximately 60) and the lack of a clear approach for the review process,

including the lack of a response to the departments, a revised process was needed which was established in spring, 2013. Members of IPBC were assigned to small subgroups and were responsible for reviewing a specific, and more manageable, number of program reviews from each of the areas – Instruction, Student Services and Learning Support Centers. A feedback rubric form, developed by the IPBC co-chairs, summarized the quality of each section of the program review as well as the overall quality of the program review and was completed for each program review. The results were shared with the instructional and student services administrators. Those program reviews with deficiencies were returned to the department for revision and resubmission. Finally, IPBC reviewed the reports to identify common themes and trends emerging from the program reviews which inform institutional planning. Data and reports are available [online](#).

- **Outcome:** The revised process for reviewing all program reviews is greatly improved. IPBC has identified common themes and trends which informs institutional planning. Departments are receiving feedback from IPBC regarding their program reviews. Lastly, the ongoing assessment and revision of the program review forms has resulted in program reviews that are more meaningful and useful to faculty and staff.

VII. Appendices

Appendix A, *Decision Matrix, Key College Initiatives, 2007-2013*

Appendix B, *Analysis of College Index Outcomes*

Appendix C, *Planning Manual*