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Recommendation 1

• In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, to ensure improvements in planning processes, including program review, are integrated with resource allocations, the team recommends that the College provide clear descriptions of the planning timeline to demonstrate integration with the budgeting process. (Standard I.B)
Evidence for Rec 1

- Demonstrate Integration of Planning Timeline with budget process - prove budget decisions are made with consideration of Planning documents.

- Planning Process overview - Docs
  - Budget Process – *Tell the story* and explain with evidence docs in support
    - Decision Making – Explain with evidence documents supporting integration of budgetary decisions and planning processes, e.g., ARPD, CPR, etc.
    - Explain the use of the Institutional Improvement matrix – show the sequence of Planning and Budgeting (how it is used and how the blocks on the chart are integrated into a planning and budgeting process).
    - Account of changes incorporated into College planning process, e.g., ARPDs, tactical plan integrated into CPR, establishing Budget related Work Groups, i.e., Planning and Budget Allocation (PABA) and Budget Execution (BEX) Work Groups.

Evidence for Rec 1
(generated at meeting)

- Documentation on CPRs and ARPDs via policy docs for both.
- Strategic Plan to ARPDs to CPRs – more examples?
- Review Standard III review for filling positions
- All allocations are tied to something – what are they tied to? Does strategic plan, ARPDs, etc. guide us in spending money?
- Planning timeline shows all planning processes – are they considered when making budgeting decisions? How, e.g., teaching equivalencies, sabbatical leaves, Perkins grants, apply for grants. Need the guidelines for each process.
Responsibility for Writing Rec 1

- Lead: Chancellor
- Others: Milton, Louise P., Sal

Recommendation 2

- In order to meet the Standards, the College **planning processes should be effectively communicated** to all College constituencies and **reviewed on an annual basis** to **ensure that resource allocation leads to program and institutional improvement.** (Standards I.B.4, I.B.6)

  — With regard to Recommendation 2 above, the Commission wishes to note that effective communication in this context involves both **college-wide dissemination and clarification** to facilitate understanding.
Evidence for Rec 2

A. List major College Planning Processes and explain each, including who is involved in creating the plans and the processes involved in producing the plans.
- ARPD, CPR, Strategic Plan, LRDP, Budget Process

• How have planning processes been effectively communicated? Who is responsible for the communication? Are the means of communication systemic to the College or based on individual units and/or departments? Are there policy statements or directives concerning communication of these processes? Provide proof of communication; provide proof of efforts of clarification of the planning processes.

• Provide evidence that exhibits the communication is effective, e.g., the Plans themselves -ARPDs, CPRs, Strategic Plan, LRDP? The number of people working on the plans? (How do we know communication is effective? If an outcome is the Plan, then is the production of a Plan proof of effective communication of the process?)

Evidence for Rec 2 (generated at meeting)

• Document dialogue an involvement of departments/faculty in ARPD and CPR processes
• If changes in process guidelines, e.g., tactical plan part of CPR needs documentation
• Program improvement – CPRs – measures for programs – are there improvements, e.g., unhealthy programs – what is being done for them, with them? Are they at top of radar?
• Institution measures – number of degrees/certificates and transfers improved?
• Stop-out or add program based on data; reallocate resource
• Explain the processes of planning, 1yr, 3 yr, 6 yrs.
Evidence for Rec 2

- C. Planning Processes Reviewed:

  Document that all Planning processes are annually reviewed, and that the process of review includes assessing whether or not resource allocation has led to program and institutional improvement.

  Utilize:
  - Program and Institutional improvement measures
  - Documentation that benchmarks have been reached
  - Documentation of relationship between planning, e.g., ARPD and CPR requests, Strategic Plan goals, and resource allocation and that this relationship has led to institutional improvement.

Responsibility for Rec 2

- Lead: Louise Pagotto and Mona Lee, Leon

- Others: Sal
Recommendation 3

- In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College **assess student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support program** and incorporate the findings into **course and program improvements**. (Eligibility Requirement I 0, Standards I.B. I.B.J, II.A.l.a, II.A.l.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, JLA.2.e, II.A.2.fIT.A.2.i, II.A.3, TI.B.4, TT.C.2)

Evidence for Rec 3

- Assess SLOs:
  - Provide examples and complete evidence of assessment of SLOs for every course, instructional program, student support program.

  - Provide examples and complete evidence of analysis of assessment and resulting action statements showing incorporation of assessment of SLOs into course and program improvement efforts.
Responsibility for Rec 3

• Lead: Louise Pagotto

• Others: Charles, Frank, Patricia

Recommendation 4

• In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College utilize student learning outcomes assessment to support institutional planning decisions. (Standards I.B, I.B.I, II.A.I.a, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i, II.A.3, II.B.4, II.C.2)
Evidence Rec 4

- Documentation that SLO, course and program assessment data has been used to support institutional planning, e.g., through ARPD, CPR and resulting Budget processes.

  – Show relationship between assessment data and ARPD, CPR, and budgeting efforts to the Strategic Plan, grant efforts, Performance Based budgeting efforts, etc.??

Responsibility Rec 4

- Lead: Louise Pagotto, Mona Lee, Leon

- Others: Milton, Sal
Recommendation 5

• In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College: 
  1) **identify student learning outcomes** for all student services programs, 
  2) **assess** student attainment of these outcomes, and 
  3) **conduct dialogue** to use assessment results to implement program improvements. (Standards II.B.4, II.C.2)

Evidence for Rec 5

- Document Student Services Programs SLOs.

- Document SLO assessment Student Services Programs

- Documentation of dialogue relate to the use of assessment results to implement program improvements

- Provide specific examples of each of the above
Responsibility

• Lead: Mona Lee, Dawn

• Others:

Recommendation 6

• (UHCC Rec 3)

• In order to meet the Standard, the UHCC and the colleges shall take appropriate actions to ensure that regular evaluations of all faculty members and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes include, as a component of the evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.I.c)
Responsibility

• Lead: UHCC VP Office

Recommendation 7

• In order to meet the Standard, and the recommendation made in 2006, the team recommends that the College **fill the vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College** and **remedy the time lag** between the verbal commitment and an employee's start day of effected employees.

• (Standard III.A.2)
Evidence for Rec 7

- Document process for determining “vacancies deemed essential to the running of the College.”

- List of vacancies in this category and efforts since visit to hire vacancies. Provide proof of efforts, e.g., numbers hired vs. vacancies, minutes from Wednesday morning meetings discussing vacancies and progress, etc.

- Documentation of hiring of these vacancies.

- Documentation that illustrates time it takes to hire faculty, APT, and civil service positions; analysis of the data; improvements plan and implementation plan. (Verbal commitment is not official commitment and therefore process of hiring should be explained).

Responsibility for Rec 7

- Lead: Milton Higa

- Others: Louise Pagotto and Mona Lee
Recommendation 8

• In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College develop a technology plan to identify technology needs and inform the budgeting process. (Standard III.C)

Evidence for Rec 8

• Technology Plan
• Documentation of connection between Technology Plan and budgeting process
• Explain and show proof of process for devising the Technology Plan
• Evidence that Technology Plan is integrated into other planning processes leading to institutional improvement
• Plan should include assessment process for the plan
Responsibility for Rec 8

- Lead: Mary Hattori
- Others: Louise Pagotto

Recommendation 9

- In order to fully meet the Standards, it is recommended that the College **clarify** and **strengthen** the review, assessment and planning recommendation **roles** of the Policy, Planning and Assessment Council to **better serve and inform** the College community and **better align governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System**. (Standards III.D.. TV.A., IV.B.)
Evidence for Rec 9

- Clarify the review, assessment, and planning recommendation roles of the PPAC. Include documentation from UH system re: shared and participatory governance clarifying authority and role of AGOs vs. Standing Councils.

- Explain that “Strengthen the review, assessment, and planning recommendation roles of the PPAC” could be construed as contradicting the “governance decision-making structures with those of the UH System.”

Responsibility for Rec 9

- Lead: Chancellor Richards

- Others: Sal
- Faculty ID Key Assignment(s) for specific SLO(s) 3/11-3/25/13 & Plan & Implement & Document *Learning Assessment - 5/10/13;
- HR & CELTT Write Response to Specific Recommendations 3/11 – 5/31/13
- Deans/VCs Organize LARs Submitted by Depts/Acs Support/Student Affairs/HR/CELTT into Responses to **ACCJC Recommendations - 6/3 - 7/15/13
- Depts/Programs Submit Comprehensive Program Review 3/31/13 w/Tech needs (Budget/CELTT), & *Learning Assess data/plan
- ALO Integrates Responses to Recommendation Submitted by VCs/Deans 7/16/13 – 7/25/13
- Admin Staff Review Draft I from ALO – 7/25 - 7/31/13
- Admin Staff Review/Edit Draft I at Admin Staff Retreat - 8/1/13
- AGO Reps Review Draft II 8/15 - 8/22/13
- PPAC & AGOs Review DRAFT III Report - 9/2 - 9/16/13
- Editing and Printing 9/16 – 10/8/13
- Submits Report to ACCJC 10/15/13

*Assessment of Competencies
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