Overview of Annual Planning for 2013-2014  
“Looking at last year to plan for next year”

Evidence of Strengthened Process for 2013-2014 –

- **Board Planning Priorities** informed the entire program reviews process
- **Annual Timeline** advanced a framework which clarified roles and expectations
- **Program review form** modified to increase emphasis on outcomes assessments, and for the first time, to address possible reductions
- **Guidelines** for those writing program reviews clarified process and expectations – this cycle included 107 completed program reviews
- **Rubric** used by administrators to rate and rank 270 resource requests
- **Chancellor and Vice Chancellor priority lists** were presented to the Planning Committee, the Participatory Governance Council, and were also posted online
- Highest ranked priorities from program review incorporated into the Final Budget for 2013-2014
- The Annual Plan for 2013-2014 embedded into the Final Budget for 2013-2014 – its component parts include an overview of the current process, identified areas for improvement during the next cycle, highlights of accomplishments for the current year, and a list of the identified priorities

**Note:** Improvements identified through spring 2013 “interim evaluation,” planning committee review, and academic senate recommendations.

Identified Areas to Improve During Next Cycle –

- Increase college-wide communications about program review
- Increase dialogue within departments, between departments, and with supervisors
- Demonstrate links between outcomes assessments, program needs, and program improvements
- Clarify rubric criteria and more fully document rationales for prioritization
- Identify ways to appropriately address reductions and/or reallocations when warranted
- Create a more overt mechanism for participation of faculty and other constituent groups in prioritization, reduction, and reallocation processes
- Fully incorporate a timely review of roll-over budgets at the department / unit level
- Establish a mechanism for addressing concerns about data integrity and completeness
- Further integrate Perkins and incorporate other grants
- Fully integrate Center reviews and School summaries into the program review process
- Better differentiate between types of requests (e.g., ongoing versus one-time costs)
- Develop criteria for handling “emergency” requests occurring outside the regular cycle
- Strengthen the relationship between program review and longer-term planning for facilities, staffing, and technology, including investigating options for a new centralized reporting system
- Consider ways to expand view beyond next year, particularly in preparation for long-term Education Master Planning