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**Recommendation 5 (2006):** The college should develop a sustainable reiterated cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation by strengthening its information collection and dissemination for program review, and concentrating on implementation of the master plan and its ambitious planning agenda. *(Standard I.A.4, I.B)*

West Los Angeles College has been incrementally improving its planning processes for many years, and in the fall of 2012 is in the position to assess its cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation to gage improvement in institutional effectiveness. West has systematically updated its plans, to the point that a new Integrated Master Plan is being contemplated to integrate systematically-collected data, such as Program Reviews and environmental scans.

In the first decade of the 21st century, West Los Angeles College recognized the need for systematic planning; learned how to make plans and systematically use them to guide decision-making; and began to do so. By 2012, West was using a set of interlocking master plans and, at the same time, systematically revising them.

The first of these plans to have been written and adopted was the Integrated Master Plan (2002-2003). Consultants hired to guide West primarily in assessing its long-term facilities needs facilitated extensive planning discussions and drafted the more-than-500-page document which the appropriate shared-governance constituencies recommended for approval.

In spring 2007, West adopted an Educational Master Plan (EMP), the first step in updating and strengthening the Integrated Master Plan by refining its component plans to better address the college’s needs. A Student Services Strategic Plan (SSSP) followed in fall 2007, and a Technology Master Plan in 2009. The EMP and SSSP were each updated in 2011. College Committees wrote each of these plans. Each of the plans focuses on strategic three-to-seven-year goals, replacing the laudable, but less-focused plans of the IMP. The EMP and SSSP included implementation matrices to document progress.

West’s Program Review process predates all these plans. Since first implementing this college-wide process in 1998(?) as Program Review/Unit Planning, the college has made incremental, iterative improvements, so that in 2011 Program Review anchored a full cycle of integrated planning, resource allocation, plan implementation and evaluation. In fall of 2012 Program Review moved online, using a new software system, IES. The program review section calls for the evaluation of progress and identification of needs; the planning section includes goal-setting, action plans, and any necessary resource requests. The Dean of Research and Planning conducted five workshops in fall 2012 and produced a Program Review Handbook so that all chairs, mangers and deans understand the new system, and emphasize S.M.A.R.T. goals. The revised instrument calls for measurable goals in all plans.

---------

This draft draws primarily on information from the Corrective Action Matrix and has not been widely discussed.
For Program Review, Research and Planning provides data such as

- Student tracking trends
- Course enrollment trends
- Section count trends
- Student demographic trends
- Student success trends
- Labor market information
- Environmental scan information

For the first time, a validation rubric will be used in assessing the quality of each Program Review, and cross-divisional validation is being piloted in six divisions and programs. Also new to this cycle are questions that require chairs and other managers to consider how a decrease in funding would affect their work.

[Do we need to review the history of our Program Review Process in this report?]