Executive Summary

Results indicate that the College Annual Plan aligns well with the Educational Master Plan; in that the two documents have significant overlap and redundancy. This is an area we can strengthen by having the Educational Master Plan serve as an overarching and guiding multi-year document with the college’s broad goals identified and in alignment with the District Strategic Plan. The College Annual Plan would be the objectives and activities performed annually in order to achieve outcomes of the Educational Master Plan. There is alignment of the Cluster plans to the College Annual Plan, and in previous evaluations and feedback from the ACCJC visiting team for the 2013 Follow Up Visit, it was suggested some of the detail and minutiae could be extracted to be more concise and clear.

Obtaining evidence of outcomes for the College Annual Plan is in progress and will be added to the evaluation upon compilation of materials in April 2014.

A recommendation to go to a multi-year planning cycle would benefit the college in several ways: first, it will provide the college adequate time to evaluate and more effectively tie program review results into planning processes. Second, it will slow down the cycle so that the college is not always in planning mode: it will allow time for implementation and assessment. Third, shortening the length of time for academic Program Reviews will keep outcomes and evidence for improvement more salient to the current planning cycle. Third, achieving deadlines has been somewhat problematic for the college. Some have indicated it is due to constantly being in planning mode, and others attribute it to other causes. Planning is currently under the auspices of the College Planning Council, and perhaps because there is not an administrator assigned to the process that it does not have the oversight, follow through and follow up, and calendar management that is needed. Consideration should be given to providing a “home” to planning within the administrative function of the college.


1. How does the College Annual Plan align with the college’s Educational Master Plan?

Evidence: The College Annual Plan is in exact alignment with the EMP; please refer to the EMP evaluation for comments/evaluation already made. In this section of the CAP evaluation (due to trying to limit the scope of the EMP evaluation), the un-evaluated pieces from the EMP will therefore be evaluated in the CAP. The Cluster plans have placed into their respective “A”, “B”, “C”, and “D” sections. Additionally, the college calls to mind the Actionable Improvement Items which need to be addressed in the next Accreditation cycle.

Evaluation: There needs to be a distinction between the college Educational Master Plan and the College Annual Plan as they serve two different needs. The college could better achieve the EMP goals if the College Annual Plan objectives and measurable outcomes were more delineated. In this instance, leaving the Cluster prioritization in the CAP, but removing it from the EMP.

CPC validation summary in regard to alignment of the College Annual Plan to the Educational Master Plan:

- Align- yes, because there is little distinction between the two documents.
- Agree with evaluation as stated above.
CPC validation summary in regard to alignment of the College Annual Plan to the Educational Master Plan continued:

- What it doesn’t do is follow through so that we can finish and evaluate. Unfunded district and state mandates drive laudable goals which limit an ability to control budgets and equitably distribute resources.
- The EMP should be a multi-year cycle and the CAP should be the tool by which implementation on an annual basis takes place.
- In the current model we are always in planning mode and it is difficult to move to implementation and evaluation.

2. Did the college achieve the goals outlined by the College Annual Plan?

Evidence: In reviewing the Cluster plans within the CAP, there is not a means for evidence collection and review of evidence as activities are not widely publicized. Enactment of plans is generally not contained within meeting minutes;

Evaluation: The college needs to develop an assessment instrument which is completed annually by the units, clusters, and then by CPC to evaluate the plans (as they flow from unit → cluster → CPC). Having a simple form which can be completed and is based in evidence will further strengthen the college’s preparation for accreditation in 2015. At best, many of the activities outlined in the College Annual Plan have been accomplished; with exception to the Part Ds which have funding implications for the college. As mentioned in other planning evaluation documents, the focus of Goals → Objectives → Activities → Outcomes would further strengthen the plan as well as measuring/evaluating future plans.

CPC validation summary in regard to achieving goals outlined by the College Annual Plan:

- Difficult to discern because the CAP does not include the specific goals, matched to college goals, matched to District goals.
- Evidence collection is difficult because we rush off into another direction before we finish a cycle.
- Yes, with the exception of all deadlines.

3. Suggestions for improvement for the process/product of the College Annual Plan?

Evidence: Because of the complexity of evidence gathering needed to evaluate the College Annual Plan and its content being very overlapping with the EMP, a suggestion for improvement is simplicity.

Evaluation: Focusing on Goals → Objectives → Activities → Outcomes would further strengthen the College Annual Plan.

CPC validation summary in regard to improvement of the process/product of the College Annual Plan:

- Agree with the above evaluation. At present the CAP and the EMP are practically the same document and are a compilation of existing documents. Need to create a distinction and base the process on District goals.
- The various areas of the campus inevitably competing for scarce resources. A cooperative method of implementation over a reasonable period of time (3-5 years).
- EMP should focus on goals and objectives
- CAP should focus on activities and outcomes

4. Validation by College Planning Committee:

Upon reviewing the College Annual Plan and reviewing the evaluation summary, the College Planning Committee recommends the following action:

- The EMP should be a multi-year cycle and the CAP should be the tool by which implementation on an annual basis takes place.
- Establish a multi-year cycle to incorporate all aspects of a planning cycle: evaluate, plan, implement, evaluate
- EMP should focus on goals and objectives
- CAP should focus on activities and outcomes