

# 2019 Planning and Decision-Making Processes Assessment Report

Presented to a joint meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee and the  
Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
19 March 2019  
*Revised after Joint-Meeting Feedback*

The Planning and Decision-Making Process Task Force reviewed the results of the 2019 Planning and Decision-Making Process Survey. Below, the task force has documented the five most important results from the survey and has made tentative recommendations related to these results. The task force recommendations were revised after the P&B/IEC joint meeting in order to incorporate member feedback.

1. Low survey response rate, high frequency of “no opinion.”

There were only 60 respondents to the assessment survey (compared to nearly 100 in 2017). In addition, many respondents had “no opinion” in regards to the questions. The prevalence of the “no opinion” response was particularly remarkable for questions about strategic planning, some of which garnered over 40% of responses as “no opinion.”

**Recommendation 1A:** The task force recommends that administrators and committee leaders develop additional, effective strategies for discussing institutional processes—and the results of those processes—with the institutional community as a whole.

2. The most positive result was in response to question #17 on the survey: “The Integrated Planning Manual 2017 defines timelines and accountability and effectively describes how the components in district planning processes link to one another in a cycle of evaluation.” In response to this question, 77.7% of respondents said that they agreed or strongly agreed this statement.

**Recommendation 2A:** None.

3. The second most positive result was in response to the “student equity” component of the question #13 matrix. In response to the statement, “The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about student equity,” 73.68% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed.

**Recommendation 3A:** None.

4. The lowest result in the survey was in response to question #12: “The institution effectively communicates the results of assessment of student learning and achievement.” Only 42.86% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (where as 33.93% disagreed or strongly disagreed). Comments suggest that student learning data is “siloeed” within programs and that is it not being sufficiently discussed through dialogue.

**Recommendation 4A:** The task force recommends that responsible parties ensure that

directors and division chairs know the accreditation standards and expectations for dialogue about student learning and achievement data as well as the current protocol for recording and documenting evidence of that dialogue.

**Recommendation 4B:** The task force encourages the IPPR Committee, SLOA leaders, and other stakeholders to review the frequency and method of SLOA reporting in order to increase dialogue and regular, effective documentation of assessment activities, results, and dialogue.

**Recommendation 4C:** Page 23-24 of the Integrated Planning Manual states the following: “The Institutional Effectiveness Committee analyzes the student learning outcome sections of the periodic comprehensive reviews to identify measurements related to institutional effectiveness and institutional learning outcomes. The results of this analysis will be consolidated in a report that will be defined in the coming academic year.”

This review has not been completed during the past few years, and the task force recommends that omission of this analysis be addressed by consultation between the IEC, the IPPR committee, the Senate, and other relevant constituent bodies.

Note: In past practice, this report did not evaluate the quality of IPPR documents but rather looked for common themes related to student needs or achievement of outcomes that might need to be addressed at the institutional level. This report was compiled and then shared at Cabinet.

5. The second lowest result was in response to question #16: “The process for resource allocation is efficient and effective.” Only 41.38% rated this process as “efficient,” and only 33.33% rated it “effective.” The comments regarding this question are broad ranging and do not pinpoint a common point of concern.

**Recommendation 5A:** The task force recommends that for the next survey, this question be broken into sub-questions so that the specific concerns of constituents can be discerned and clarified.

*Additional recommendations for document updates based on survey comments and task force assessment:*

- In the Integrated Planning Manual, the timeline for the Planning and Decision-Making Assessment Process should be moved up so that it begins in November or December in order to ensure timely distribution of the assessment survey (page 34).
- In the Integrated Planning Manual, modify the first step of the timeline on page 34 to eliminate the need for the first joint meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee and

Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The committees can designate members for the task force without a full joint meeting.

- For the CPPR, examples should be provided modeling how programs can and should draw connections to the Strategic Plan and to Institutional Goals.
- In the Integrated Planning Manual, update the following: timeline dates, document names, mission information, and Strategic Plan Progress Report protocol.
- In the Participatory Governance: Decision-Making and Governance Handbook, update the following: resources/citations, dates, BPs/APs, committee names, committee members, and chart structure.
- Review proposal documents and decision-making process to ensure that proposer, the CC, and Senate are clear about where a proposal needs to go first and whether or not it has already been through designated channels. (See Comment #3 on the last question of the survey to review the specific complaint.)
- Review timeline for strategic planning (Integrated Planning Manual, p. 14) to ensure it serves the current strategic planning process.