**Recommendation #1:** As previously stated in Recommendation 2 by the 2006 Comprehensive Evaluation Team and in order to meet Standards, the planning process needs to reflect an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation that use data as the central focus to inform decisions. The process needs to be made clear to the college constituencies so they understand the steps, as well as which plan informs which plan. In addition, human resource planning for classified personnel and administrators needs to be evidence-based and integrated with institutional planning and program review. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the planning process as well as the effectiveness of programs and services needs to be included.

**Recommendation #1** (above) requires the College to provide evidence that:

[A]  the college’s planning process is an ongoing, systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation.
   - Updated college planning forms to clarify link between budget and planning
   - Updated Participatory Governance Agreement (9/24/12)
   - Incorporated evidence from student learning outcomes into planning process

[B]  the college’s planning process uses data as its central focus to inform decisions.
   - Established rubric methodology to evaluate and prioritize college planning actions
   - Created Planning Documents Flow Process Diagram (below)
   - Updated Participatory Governance Agreement (9/24/12)
   - Created Planning Document which shows who is responsible for leading the writing of planning documents

[C]  the college’s planning process is clear to the college constituencies, so they understand each step in the process, and how each of the plans in the process informs other plans.
   - Adoption of the diagrams and documents by the shared governance process (Academic Senate and CPC)
   - Planning Retreats held and information shared (June 2012, August 2012, Sept. 2012, January 2013)

[D]  the process for human resource planning for classified personnel and administrators is done in a way that is evidence-based and integrated with institutional planning and program review.
   - Completed Human Resources Plan 2012-13; Human Resources Plan 2013-14 is in development with goal for completion by March 2013

[E]  the college’s planning process includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the planning process; as well as the effectiveness of the programs and services involved.
   - Spring 2012 completed Network Analysis (Communication Audit)
   - Fall 2012 completed evaluation of planning process survey which included qualitative and quantitative methods
   - Spring 2013 complete the evaluation of 2012-13 planning actions/outcomes implemented audit

**COLLEGE PLANNING DOCUMENTS FLOW PROCESS**

![Diagram of College Planning Documents Flow Process](image-url)
Recommendation #2: In order to meet the Standard, and to adequately monitor salary and benefit expenditures and insure the institution practices effective oversight of finances, the team recommends that salary actions should first be reviewed for available and adequate funding prior to initiating the employment process.

Recommendation #2 may be divided into two major tasks:

[A.] Monitoring and effective oversight of the college finances.
   - Adopted Centralized Budget Model
   - Adopted a college Budget Timeline
   - Quarterly meetings to reconcile accounts

[B.] “Salary actions will be reviewed to guarantee available and adequate funding prior to initiating the employment process.”
   - Form created to use when requesting a position which requires approval and sign off by all levels of authority (initiated by Chairs, approved by Deans, approved by VP, Approved by President)
   - Tracked personnel costs in Program 100 and in Grants
   - Using the Human Resources Plan as a means to plan for FON and future faculty salary actions

About our Accreditation Process:
Accreditation Steering Committee met twice per month. Created Task Lists with designated responsibilities. Monitored progress and updated as progress was made. Accreditation Standards Teams met; with Standard 1 meeting every month because of the nature of our Recommendations from the ACCJC. All action items were vetted through the shared governance process, as was the Follow Up Report (with approvals from the Academic Senate and CPC).