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Recommendation 2: Program Review

The team recommends that the college further refine its program review, planning, and resource allocation processes so that they are more clearly based on an analysis of quality, effectiveness, and student learning. Furthermore, the college must develop a systematic means to evaluate those processes and assess whether its plans actually lead to improvements in programs and services (I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7).

Merritt College has been charged with addressing Standards I.B.3, I.B.6 and I.B.7 in the context of program review, planning, and resource allocation to provide the Commission with evidence that the College assesses its processes in order to measure institutional effectiveness. In response to this recommendation, the College Accreditation Committee reviewed the Accreditation standards cited and assessed the College’s progress in meeting those standards.

Standard I.B.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.

In 2005, Merritt College designed and approved an Integrated Planning and Budgeting Model to establish a cycle of ongoing planning, and to articulate Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities for the College. The Planning and Budgeting Model, Strategic Directions, and Institutional Priorities were presented to the College campus in forums and to the College Council for feedback and approval.

The College Annual Unit Plan process began in 2005, and has functioned as the evaluation tool to assess progress toward achieving goals outlined in the Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities. In addition, the unit planning process was intended to capture and document departmental goals, articulate division/unit goals, and identify resources needed to attain those goals. The College Institutional Researcher populated the Unit Plans with departmental quantitative data such as FTES and FTEF numbers, productivity, and student performance measures disaggregated by ethnicity. Departmental and unit faculty and staff provided qualitative data such as community and labor market relevance, curriculum development, SLO assessment, and program action plans intended to address the student performance measures. A major
component of the annual planning process is the documenting of resources needed to support programs: human, fiscal, and physical.

From the outset, the departmental Unit Plans have undergone administrative review, analysis, and recommendation for resource allocation. The Integrated Planning and Budgeting process itself has undergone two cycles of evaluation and revision. The first evaluation resulted in the realization that the planning and budgeting model was not effective because it was too cumbersome and time-consuming. Faculty and staff were reluctant to serve on the Integrated Planning Committee because of the time commitment in reviewing and analyzing unit plans in order to make recommendations to College Council.

The process was streamlined by assigning the responsibility for unit plan analysis to unit administrators. Recommendations were submitted to College Council by the Integrated Planning Committee, at which time the second evaluation cycle was set in motion when College Council members realized that after approval by the College president, there was nowhere to forward funding recommendations if funding was beyond the capacity of the College. This deficiency was resolved when the Peralta District established an integrated planning and budgeting model (PBIM) that solicited resource requests from the Peralta colleges based on district strategic goals and college strategic directions and institutional priorities.

Adjustments have been made to the Integrated Planning and Budgeting Cycle such that program review, unit planning, and student learning outcomes assessment figure as the major inputs in the planning and budgeting cycle (Appendix A). Analysis of the inputs is used systematically by managers and the College Educational Master Planning Committee to inform decision-making, resource allocations, and institutional priorities. In addition, evaluation of the program review process and the integrated planning and budgeting process has been formally added to the integrated planning and budgeting cycle (Appendices B and C).

Annual Unit Plans are used as an annual update of the College Educational Master Plan, and as a significant component of Program Review. The College and District are on a three-year Program Review cycle, and instructional and student support services Program Reviews were completed in spring 2010. In spring 2011, all administrative services will complete Program Review: the President’s Office, the Offices of the Vice Presidents, Division Deans and Student Services Dean, and Business Services.

This fall, rather than engaging in the unit planning process, the College is participating in a district-coordinated effort to complete an Annual Program Review Update using a template created and populated with data by district Educational Services. The objective is to capture resource requests articulated in Program Reviews completed in
spring 2010 across the district. These requests will then become part of the district Planning and Budgeting Integration Model for resource allocation in 2011-12.

Standard I.B.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.*

In fall 2010, the College’s Accreditation Committee formalized the evaluation process by drafting an Evaluation Tool for College constituencies to assess the Program Review process in fall and spring, as well as to assess the usefulness of the Evaluation Tool itself (Appendix B). The Tool was reviewed in September by the College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC), which recommended that the evaluations be sent via Survey Monkey for more efficient compilation and analysis of data received. Evaluation of the spring 2010 Program Review process is scheduled to be completed by mid-November. CEMPC will forward findings from evaluation of the Program Review process and recommendations to modify the process to College Council.

Next, the Accreditation Committee undertook to design an evaluation tool to assess the effectiveness of Merritt College’s Integrated Planning and Budgeting Process in seven areas (Appendix C):

1. **Inputs**: templates or forms, such as the Annual Unit Planning template and Program Review template used as conduits of information to inform decision making by governance bodies such as CEMPC and College Council.
2. **Linkage between Governance Committees**: planning relationships among the major governance committees.
3. **Effectiveness of Governance Committees**
4. **Prioritization of Resources**
5. **Outcomes**
6. **Implementation**
7. **Timeline**

The questions created for each of these areas were informed by the Integrated Planning and Budgeting Model Flow Chart and by the Bylaws contained in the Shared Governance Manual. Again, the evaluations will be sent to targeted groups via Survey Monkey, and the results will be compiled, analyzed, and shared with the College community. If the findings from the evaluation suggest that modifications to the Integrated Planning and Budgeting model are necessary, then CEMPC will forward recommendations to College Council.
The College can demonstrate that its planning processes foster improvement and lead to attainment of College priorities. In 2005, the Integrated Planning and Budgeting process resulted in identified Strategic Directions and Institutional Priorities. Many of the goals outlined under Institutional Priorities have been addressed and met as presented below.

### INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES REFLECTING 2005–2010 STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

#### Strategic Direction I: Student Learning Outcomes

Improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning at Merritt College through the development and implementation of student learning outcomes for both instruction and support services.

### 2005-06 Institutional Priority: Develop agreed-upon institutional Student Learning Outcomes.

#### Progress to Date

In 2008, the College drafted and approved Institutional Learning Outcomes through a rigorous shared governance process (Appendix D). Some programs at Merritt College that offer associate degrees have chosen to use the Institutional Learning Outcomes as their Program Outcomes.

### 2006-07 Institutional Priority: Each unit will identify expected outcomes as to what students should know and/or be able to do as a consequence of completing a course or program or utilizing a support service AND develop related tools and processes for assessment of same.

#### Progress to Date

Merritt College is continuing the process of identifying program and course outcomes, and is assessing course outcomes in an ongoing cycle of assessment. In fall 2010 Merritt College has gone to full implementation of our assessment action plan, which now has a two pronged approach. One focus is on completing the SLO creation work in the fall 2010 semester. The college has given release time to an SLO Coordinator to complete this task. The second focus is on closing the assessment loop in 2010-11 for all disciplines either in the fall semester or spring semester, half in each. A faculty lead Assessment Coordinator was funded for this purpose. The Assessment Coordinator has
developed a plan for implementation of the course-embedded assessment of most of the courses Merritt College offers academic year 2010-11 (Appendix E).

The plan calls for ALL faculty, full- and part-time, to assess at least one course. Binders were created for each discipline with the required forms and documentation for implementing the plans, and meetings were set with department chairs and key faculty to begin implementation. The result has been a complete campus buy-in to assessment as an essential feature of our new pedagogical culture, a real culture shift. According to the plan, assessments tasks will be administered to the students, assessment of the results will be recorded on forms provided to the faculty, discipline and department faculty will meet to discuss the results of individual course SLO assessments, and then plans will be made individually and collectively to improve teaching and student success based on the assessments and discussions, effectively closing the loop. Courses only offered in one semester will now be assessed the following year, covering all courses and all SLOs in a timely manner.

All Student Services units have updated their Program Review documents to include a follow up in October 2010 assessing progress on goals articulated in the February 2010 Student Services Program Review document. Half of the Student Services units have assessed student outcomes and are analyzing the data during fall 2010 prior to implementing programmatic changes to improve student success (see Appendix E for Student Services Assessment Plan). Merritt College is confident that we will reach proficiency by the year 2012.

**Strategic Direction II: Culture of Communication**

Make clear communication and listening a way of life at Merritt College in order to arrive at truly shared values and to develop an appreciation of the diverse perspectives of the College community.

**2005-06 Institutional Priority:** a) Implement the new Merritt Integrated Planning and Budgeting System; b) Create a shared understanding of how institutional effectiveness is defined and measured; c) Develop agreed-upon systems for communicating ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress among college constituencies in a timely manner.

**Progress to Date**

In March 2005, Merritt College approved an Integrated Planning and Budgeting Model. The College completed the majority of the steps in the Model, including the following:

1. Conduct a Situational Analysis
2. Recommend 3-5 Strategic Directions
3. Recommend annual Institutional Priorities (completed through 2006-07)
4. Receive endorsement from College Council
5. Develop annual Department Action Plans (this has been ongoing since 2005)
6. Review and synthesize Department Action Plans
7. Forward resource recommendations to College Council

In fall 2010, the Accreditation Committee drafted evaluation tools with which to assess 1) the College’s Program Review process, and 2) the effectiveness of the College’s planning and budgeting processes. The draft evaluation tools will be presented to CEMPC (the College Educational Master Planning Committee) in October and to College Council in November for approval. The Program Review process will be evaluated fall 2010 by programs that completed Program Review in spring 2010, and in spring 2011 for programs/units completing Program Review during that term. The College’s planning and budgeting process will be evaluated by all College constituencies at the completion of the 2011-12 budgeting cycle in May of 2011 (see Assessment Plan, p. 15).

**2006-07 Institutional Priority:** Each unit in the College will implement forums, systems and opportunities for communicating ideas, information, decisions, news, priorities, action plans and progress within each unit and college-wide AND evaluate the effectiveness of the forums and systems.

**Progress to Date**

College-wide forums have become a primary means of soliciting input and/or feedback, communicating college and district initiatives, and drafting plans for the College. A striking example of this is the 2009 Merritt College Facilities Master Plan, based on significant college-wide input and vetted at college-wide forums. We have hosted informational forums on Title III, MAP, college initiatives and plans, and accreditation recommendations. At a recent Title III gathering, feedback was solicited from all participants on what actions the College should **STOP, START,** and **CONTINUE** doing. The information was submitted to College administration for review and action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Direction III: Technology and Media Resources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and maintain technological, information and media resources that support the needs of students, faculty, and staff and that are consistent with the College’s mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2005-06 Institutional Priority:** a) Implement effective and efficient processes and procedures for requesting and accessing Audio-Visual equipment and publish User Guidelines; b) Inventory Audio-Visual resources on campus, assess needs and develop an A-V Plan for Merritt; c) Inventory technology resources on campus, assess needs, and develop a Preliminary Technology Plan.
**Progress to Date**

Merritt College’s Audio-Visual Supervisor began the AV inventory process preparatory to developing an A-V Plan for Merritt. Unfortunately, he became ill and retired, and the position was not filled due to budget constraints. The Office of Instruction established an online system for ordering AV equipment and hired an hourly staff person to accommodate faculty AV needs.

The CEMPC Recommendations submitted to College Council in November 2008 included the following as Priority #4: *Technology upgrades, particularly for smart classrooms and computer labs.* This resource request was presented to the Planning and Budgeting Council through the district-wide Planning and Budgeting Integration Model developed and approved in 2008. Since smart classrooms were requested district wide, the Smart Classroom Project was initiated by General Services and is scheduled to be completed by December 2010.

**2006-07 Institutional Priority:** Based on the 2005-06 inventory and assessment of technology and media resources on campus and the preliminary plan, the college will a) adopt and implement a Comprehensive Technology Plan; and b) implement the newly developed Audio-Visual Plan.

**Progress to Date**

A preliminary outline for a College Technology Plan was drafted in 2006 and presented to College Council for review. The outline documented the need to address technology issues such as smart classrooms, funding for computer upgrades, development of information technology systems such as online registration, campus-wide wireless access, web pages, and security systems. As part of the district-wide strategic planning process, four district-wide committees were created: Facilities Committee; Technology Committee; Education Committee, and the Planning and Budgeting Council. Each college submitted a Technology Resource List to the district Technology Committee in March 2010.

[**Merritt’s memo to the District Technology Committee**]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE (CEMPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>March 4, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is the Technology Resource List identified by Merritt College’s CEMPC. The list has been endorsed by the chairs of Merritt’s Technology Committee, and will be submitted to Merritt’s College Council on March 17, 2010.

#1  **Smart Classrooms**
#2  **Website Redesign and Implementation**
#3  **Computer Lab upgrades**
#4  **WiFi throughout campus**
#5  **Digital Messaging System**
An outcome of the district-wide collaboration was the determination that smart classrooms district-wide would be the primary technology priority in 2010-11.

Merritt College’s #2 priority - Website Redesign and Implementation - is currently being addressed with district funding for each college to redesign and reorganize their websites.

### Strategic Direction IV: Human, Fiscal, and Physical Resources

Develop an institutional approach to optimize the utilization of existing resources and develop adequate future resources to support Merritt’s mission.

#### 2005-06 Institutional Priority:

a) Explore grants and partnerships that effectively link our curriculum with community/industry needs, and develop a comprehensive list of such opportunities.  
b) Evaluate our campus facilities for proper maintenance, accessibility and utilization, and prioritize our needs.  
c) Expedite the completion of the building remodel projects that are in process.  
d) Assess faculty and staff training and mentoring needs as well as develop a comprehensive list.

#### 2006-07 Institutional Priority:

a) Based on the 2005-06 exploration opportunities, establish business partnerships, create service learning initiatives, and pursue grants, gifts, donations, and additional facility rental options.  
b) Based on 2005-06 evaluation and prioritization, implement facilities maintenance, accessibilities, and utilization plan.  
c) Expedite the completion of the building remodel projects that are in process.  
d) Implement faculty and staff training and mentoring as an investment in our human resources.

### Progress to Date

#### A. Grants and Partnerships

Merritt College has been very successful in receiving grant awards and establishing partnerships that link the College’s curriculum with community and industry needs. In 2004, Merritt became part of an EDD-funded Healthcare Sector Initiative in the city of Oakland, California, that includes community health clinics (La Clinica, Native American Health, Asian Health, Tiburcio Vazquez) as well as the Spanish Speaking Unity Council. The objective of this Sector Initiative was to design and implement a Medical Assistant Program that provides trained medical assistants for the community health clinics. In September 2010, Merritt accepted its 11th cohort and graduated its 9th cohort. Currently, this partnership has applied for and been awarded EDD and DOL grants to design and implement a Chronic Care Assistant Program to train incumbent medical
assistants to work in closer partnership with physicians. This program is the first of its kind in the state, and possibly in the nation.

Since 2005, Merritt has received annual state grants for its Associate Degree Nursing Program, and HRSA federal grants for the same program, with the expected outcomes of increasing capacity, improving retention, and designing a program in medical genomics. Over $3 million dollars have been awarded to Merritt’s Associate Degree Nursing program in the past five years.

In 2008, Merritt College was awarded a five-year federal Title III – Strengthening Institutions grant intended to strengthen pathways, systems, and services to maximize student success and to improve the college’s core academic performance indicators in four key areas: retention, drop rate, course completion, and transfer. Year III of the grant focuses on three inter-related components: 1) Strengthening the curriculum for basic skills and gateway courses; 2) Expanding faculty and staff professional development to improve instruction and support services; and 3) Improving delivery and integration of academic and non-academic support services for students to enhance student success.

Merritt College is the lead agency for a recently acquired $2.9 million Department of Labor grant that focuses on workforce development and job placement in Environmental construction, Medical Assistant, and Drug and Alcohol counseling for target populations. This grant is a collaborative effort among various community partners, businesses and industry employers.

Partnerships with other learning institutions are critical in order to formalize the College mission of transfer. Merritt provides college-level instruction to high school students who have demonstrated their capacity for accelerated courses, and is forming relationships with universities in order to establish a more seamless transfer path for Merritt students. The College currently has drafted an MOU with Cal State East Bay to increase the transfer of targeted populations based on data in Merritt’s Equity Report, and is exploring similar MOUs with San Jose State and San Francisco State universities as well as a “pipeline” project with University of California – Berkeley in environmental green programs.

The internal partnership between instructional and student services programs at Merritt has resulted in greater capacity to serve students, and well as enhanced student success. Merritt was awarded a million-dollar federal Maximum Achievement Project grant to improve outcomes for African American men through increased retention, course and degree completion, and transfer rates. The model developed with grant funds has dramatically improved student success and garnered national attention, culminating in a visit by Secretary of Education Arnold Duncan in September 2010.
B. Facility Plan

Merritt College submitted an Educational Master Plan in 2009 that documented resource needs for instructional and student support services programs. With a campus that is almost 40 years old, Merritt faces serious physical plant challenges. The passing of a bond measure in 2006 has made it possible for Merritt College to address Strategic Direction IV regarding physical resources. There are currently several facility renovation and building projects as outlined below. These projects are part of Merritt College’s Facilities Master Plan.

- New Center for Science and Allied Health – to be completed in 2013
- Critical repairs to existing Science and Allied Health building
- Library renovation project with accompanying swing space construction
- Complete renovation of Business Services and Administration building
- Repair of gym floor and roof
- Upgrade of 30-year-old Landscape Horticulture facility
- Photovoltaic solar project in parking lot
- Smart Classroom project
- College-wide health and safety projects

C. Faculty and Staff Training

Faculty and staff training is an important component of upgrading skills to maximize the College’s human resources, and was identified as an ongoing institutional priority. For several years, training has been provided at Merritt to familiarize faculty and staff with the new PeopleSoft integrated database that now touches every aspect of the College and district. Early on, Merritt dedicated a facility for PeopleSoft training with the anticipation that this could become a permanent training and staff development facility. Through funding from Merritt’s Title III grant, a Teaching and Learning Center was established in 2008 to offer an annual schedule of flexible, varied, and responsive professional development activities for faculty and staff.

Standard I.B.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.

Primary mechanisms used by the College to gather evidence of program effectiveness are annual unit plans and program review, completed every three years. Both
templates rely heavily on quantitative data to report student outcomes, and on qualitative measurements to communicate the narratives behind the data. Program effectiveness can also be measured by enrollment trends, job placement, transfer rates, and so on. Examples of decisions based on a variety of data follow:

- The College’s Licensed Vocational Nurse program will be suspended as of January 2011 due to declining enrollment and employment opportunities.
- Several instructional programs such as Real Estate and Child Development had to reduce course offerings as a result of external factors: a downturn in the housing market for the Real Estate program, and a change in employment requirements for Child Development students that necessitated their enrollment in general education courses rather than Child Development electives.
- Learning Communities have been developed as one means of addressing unsatisfactory outcomes for Basic Skills students.

In spring 2010, the majority of instructional programs and all student support services programs embarked on a program review process to review data and curricula, to assess program effectiveness in the context of serving students, and to engage in program planning that would lead to resource allocation. In fall 2010, the College drafted a Program Review Evaluation Plan to assess the effectiveness of program review in 1) addressing campus needs and 2) leading to institutional improvement. The Evaluation Plan was adapted from The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, *Program Review: Setting a Standard 2008-09*.

Program Review evaluation participants include members of all college governance committees:
- Senates - Academic, Classified, and Associated Students
- Budget Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Technology Committee
- Facilities Committee
- College Council
- CEMPC – College Educational Master Planning Committee

In addition, evaluation participants include members of committees that serve a particular function at the college:
- CDCPD - Council for Department Chairs and Program Directors
- Student Success Committee
- Library Committee
- Basic Skills Committee
- SLOAC - Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee
It was decided by the College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC) that the Evaluation Questions regarding program review would be sent to the various groups via electronic surveys in order to facilitate gathering and analyzing the results for each category of participants.

The Accreditation Committee has established a timeline for assessment that includes the following:

- Design of evaluation tools
- Pilot of evaluation surveys
- Administering of surveys through Survey Monkey
- Compilation of results
- Submission of results to CEMPC and College Council
- Assessment of evaluation tools
- Dissemination of program review evaluation via website
- Discussion of the findings and recommendations to improve the process are forwarded to College Council

See Assessment Plan below for timelines, current status, and next steps. We believe that the actions outlined in the Assessment Plan provide Merritt College with a viable plan of action for measuring institutional effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Evaluation Tool for planning &amp; resource allocation processes. Present tool to CEMPC and College Council for approval and recommendation to President.</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool reviewed by Accreditation Committee. Will be presented to CEMPC October 27 and to College Council in November.</td>
<td>After approvals, electronic surveys will be created for use spring 2011 to assess planning and resource allocation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design assessment for Evaluation Tools.</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>In process. Accreditation Committee will draft assessment and present to CEMPC in November and to College Council in December.</td>
<td>After approvals, assessment process for Program Review Evaluation Tool will be conducted spring 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate results of Program Review Evaluation via website</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Merritt College website is currently undergoing a complete redesign and reorganization in order to more effectively communicate internally and externally.</td>
<td>Post results on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Program Review Evaluation Tool.</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Assessment mechanism will be drafted Fall 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMPC reviews evaluation results from Program Review Evaluation Tool.</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>CEMPC sends recommendations for process modifications to College Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Evaluation Tool for planning &amp; resource allocation processes.</td>
<td>End of Spring 2011 and every Spring</td>
<td>Assessment mechanism will be drafted Fall 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMPC reviews evaluation results from Evaluation Tool for planning &amp; resource allocation processes.</td>
<td>End of Spring</td>
<td>CEMPC sends recommendations for process modifications to College Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documents

1. Merritt College Integrated Planning and Budgeting Model
2. 2005 Annual Unit Plan
3. College Educational Master Plan
4. Program Review Guidelines
5. Annual Program Review Update
6. District Planning and Budgeting Integration Model
7. Merritt College Shared Governance Manual
8. 2009 Merritt College Facilities Master Plan
9. Preliminary Technology Plan
10. Smart Classroom Project
11. Technology Resource List, March 2010
12. Healthcare Sector Initiative Project
13. EDD Grant: 2010
14. Department of Labor Grant #1: 2010
15. Chronic Care Assistant curriculum
16. Associate Degree Nursing state grants
17. HRSA federal grant
18. Title III Strengthening Institutions grant
19. Department of Labor Grant #2: 2010
20. Contract Education agreements with area high schools and Head Start
21. Cal State East Bay MOU
22. Merritt College Equity Report
23. Federal Maximum Achievement Project grant
24. Staff Development training notices
25. Electronic evaluation surveys
APPENDICES
Appendix A: INTEGRATED PLANNING & BUDGETING PROCESS

MERRITT COLLEGE INTEGRATED PLANNING & BUDGETING PROCESS

District Mission
District Strategic Goals

Evaluation of Integrated Planning & Budgeting Process

MERRITT COLLEGE MISSION, VISION & VALUES

REVIEW, ANALYZE & VALIDATE
- Fiscal Analysis by the Business Manager
- CDBG
- CIC
- Facilities Committee
- Technology Committee
- Budget Committee

Strategic Institutional Directions

INPUTS
Program Review: Each program/unit engages in program review every 3 years
Annual Unit Plans: Each program/unit engages in annual planning cycle
Feedback from: Senates, ASMC, Administrators
Annual Campus Summit

Each manager collaboratively develops annual priorities for their area

Funding Priority Recommendations sent to College President

Funding Priority Recommendations sent to College Council

Approved Resources & Implementation

COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE (CEMPC)
- Conducts a situational analysis
- Recommends 3-5 Strategic Directions every 5 years
- Monitors SLO Assessment
- Reviews each manager's annual priorities
- Identifies institutional budget priorities based on each manager's annual summary
- Recommends Annual Institutional Priorities
- Recommends College funding priorities, based on the above
- Reviews evaluation and makes recommendations to change process
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# Appendix B: PROGRAM REVIEW EVALUATION TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Questions to Ask</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CEMPC (Institutional Effectiveness Committee)** | 1. How does program review help to improve teaching and learning?  
2. What are the positive outcomes of the program review process? and  
3. How can we improve the program review process? | Fall 2010  
Spring 2011                                                                                       |
| **Programs undergoing review**  | 1. How easy or difficult was the program review process? (one could compare it to the last cycle)  
2. How easy was it to access data?  
3. Was the process useful? How?  
4. How widespread was participation within the program?  
5. Have you made changes to your program as a result of program review? | Disseminated in Fall to programs that completed Program Review in spring 2010. Programs undergoing Program Review during spring 2011 will complete these questions at time of Program Review. |
| **Academic Senate**             | 1. How effective is program review as a means to address campus needs and improvement?  
2. Is program review linked to planning? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
3. Is program review linked to budgeting? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
4. What are the positive outcomes of the program review process?  
5. How can we improve the program review process?  
6. How can we improve the use of program review recommendations?  
7. Is program review linked to college decision-making? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
8. Is program review data driven process? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
9. Is program review a valued process on our campus? If yes, why? If no, why not? | Occurs in Fall after spring Program Reviews have been completed |
| **Budget Committee**            | 1. How is program review linked to planning?  
2. How effective is program review as a means to address campus needs and improvement?  
3. Is program review linked to planning? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
4. Is program review linked to budgeting? If yes, how so. If no, why not?  
5. How do the recommendations from program review inform this committee’s decisions?  
6. With regard to this committee’s responsibilities, are the program review recommendations useful?  
7. What are the positive outcomes of the program review process?  
8. How can we improve the program review process?  
9. How can we improve the use of program review recommendations? | Occurs in Spring during the integrated planning and resource allocation cycle |
| Basic Skills SLOAC Student Success Committee | 1. Do the recommendations from program review influence and inform this committee’s decisions?  
2. How are the program review recommendations linked to this committee’s responsibilities?  
3. With regard to this committee’s responsibilities, are the program review recommendations useful?  
4. What are the positive outcomes of the program review process?  
5. How can we improve the program review process?  
6. How can we improve the use of program review recommendations? | Occurs in Spring during the integrated planning and resource allocation cycle |
| Associated Students of Merritt College | 1. Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review?  
2. Are they involved in preparations and the self-study?  
3. Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback? | Fall 2010  
Spring 2011 |
### Appendix C: INTEGRATED PLANNING & BUDGETING PROCESS EVALUATION TOOL

#### Merritt College Integrated Planning & Budgeting Process Evaluation Tool Form
**(Spring 2011)**

## I. Inputs

What are inputs? Inputs are templates or forms (such as the Annual Unit Planning template & the SLOAC templates) used as a conduit of information to inform decision making by governance bodies such as College Council and CEMPC (College Educational Master Planning Committee).

### Annual Unit Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs undergoing review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How clear are the instructions on the Annual Unit Plan?
2. How useful are the data provided in the Annual Unit Plan?
3. Is the Annual Unit Plan template easy to use?
4. How accurate are the data provided in the Annual Unit Plan?
5. How relevant are the questions in the Annual Unit Plan?
6. How useful is information from the Annual Unit Plan?
7. To what extent does the Annual Unit Plan capture the connection between programs progress towards the strategic directions and institutional priorities?
8. How could we improve the Annual Unit Plan to ensure we are collecting relevant information that informs the college planning processes?

### Instructional Department SLO Assessment Summary Report

**Student Services: Student Learning Outcomes Summary Report**

1. How clear are the instructions on *Department SLO Assessment Summary Report*?
2. To what extent does the *Department SLO Assessment Summary Report* assist departments in documenting continuous quality improvement (assess to assist) efforts?
3. How could we improve the *Department SLO Assessment Summary Report* to ensure we are collecting relevant information that informs the college planning processes?
4. How clear are the instructions on the *Student Services Student Learning Outcomes Summary Report*?
5. To what extent does the *Student Services Student Learning Outcomes Summary Report* assist departments in documenting continuous quality improvement efforts?
6. How could we improve the *Student Services Student Learning Outcomes Summary Report* to ensure we are collecting relevant information that informs the college planning processes?

### Status Report Template

*(This is a placeholder for a status report to be completed by Project Directors of grants)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Project Directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Linkages between Governance Committees

Please comment on the planning relationships among the major governance committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students of Merritt College (ASMC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Effectiveness of Key Shared Governance Committees

Please comment on effectiveness (based on charge of the committee) of the following shared governance bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC)</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent has CEMPC been effective in reviewing and analyzing annual unit plans?</td>
<td>College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has CEMPC been effective in reviewing and analyzing the summary of priorities forwarded by the executive administrators?</td>
<td>Facilities Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent has CEMPC been effective in setting college-wide priorities based on the executive administrator’s summary?</td>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How could we improve CEMPC?</td>
<td>College Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent has the budget committee been effective in conducting a financial analysis of the college budget?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has the budget committee been effective in providing a financial analysis of the priorities forwarded by the College Council?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How effective is the budget reconciliation process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How could we improve the budget committee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent has the facilities committee been effective in recommending funding priorities for building funds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How effectively has the facilities committee advised the development of the facilities planning processes and timelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How could we improve the facilities committee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent has the technology committee been effective in identifying, prioritizing, and recommending funding strategies and priorities for areas for expansion of technological utilization for the enhancement of instructional programs, student services, and the management of the college?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has the technology committee been effective in identifying, prioritizing and recommending both ongoing and specialized training needs for maximum utilization of technological resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent has the technology committee been effective in developing an ongoing comprehensive College Technology Plan for consideration by College Council?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How could we improve the technology committee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Prioritization of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How clear is the process of prioritizing resource requests?</td>
<td>Programs undergoing review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have approved priorities been funded?</td>
<td>College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent have the approved priorities been communicated to the campus community?</td>
<td>Facilities Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, (SLOAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Students of Merritt College (ASMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Outcomes</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How effectively has the college communicated the outcomes of the shared governance process?</td>
<td>Programs undergoing review College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC) Facilities Committee Technology Committee College Budget Committee College Council Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, (SLOAC) Accreditation Committee Associated Students of Merritt College (ASMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent have the planning processes supported an assessment of progress towards the college mission and strategic directions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Implementation</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent are unit plan resource requests documented, recommended, and funded?</td>
<td>Programs undergoing review College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC) Facilities Committee Technology Committee College Budget Committee College Council Accreditation Committee Associated Students of Merritt College (ASMC) Faculty Senate Classified Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Timeline</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How clear is the planning timeline?</td>
<td>Programs undergoing review College Educational Master Planning Committee (CEMPC) Facilities Committee Technology Committee College Budget Committee College Council Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, (SLOAC) Accreditation Committee Associated Students of Merritt College (ASMC) Faculty Senate Classified Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATION
Communicate with clarity and precision using oral, nonverbal, and/or written language, expressing an awareness of audience, situation, and purpose.

CRITICAL THINKING
Think critically using appropriate methods of reasoning to evaluate ideas and identify and investigate problems and to develop creative and practical solutions to issues that arise in workplaces, institutions, and local and global communities.

QUANTITATIVE REASONING
Apply college-level mathematical reasoning to analyze and explain real world issues and to interpret and construct graphs, charts, and tables.

INFORMATION AND COMPUTER LITERACY
Use appropriate technology to identify, locate, evaluate and present information for personal, educational and workplace goals.

CULTURAL AWARENESS
Through a knowledge of history and cultural diversity, recognize and value perspectives and contributions that persons of diverse backgrounds bring to multicultural settings and respond constructively to issues that arise out of human diversity on both the local and the global level.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND ETHICS
Internalize and exhibit ethical values and behaviors that address self respect and respect for others with integrity and honesty that will enable success and participation in the larger society.
# Appendix E: LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

## INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENTS PARTICIPATING IN LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT INITIATIVE at MERRITT

### Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration of Justice</th>
<th>Geography/Geology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>Community/Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Landscape Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Medical Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Associate Degree Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Radiologic Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASAME</th>
<th>LVN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire science</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>Paralegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STUDENT SERVICES DEPARTMENTS PARTICIPATING IN LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT INITIATIVE at MERRITT

### Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSPS</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS/CARE</td>
<td>Student Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKSs</td>
<td>Admissions &amp; Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Vice Presidents Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>