

DRAFT v1

2019
Edition



AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

Integrated Planning Guide

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ARC VISION, MISSION, and COMMITMENT	2
Guiding the Integrated Planning Process.....	2
OVERVIEW OF INTEGRATED PLANNING AT ARC	3
Cohesive Planning, Resource Use, and Evaluation	4
Cycles of Planning	4
Alignment to District and System Planning.....	4
GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY	5
How It Works in Practice.....	6
Governance Responsibility by Plan	8
ARC PLANS.....	9
Institutional Equity Plan	9
Educational Master Plan	10
Strategic Plan	11
Distance Education Plan.....	12
Facilities Master Plan	13
Strategic Enrollment Management Plan	14
Employee Development and Retention Plan.....	15
Sustainability Plan	16
Technology Master Plan.....	17
PROGRAM REVIEW AND UNIT PLANNING	18
Cyclical Pattern.....	19
Program Review	20
Annual Unit Planning	21
INTEGRATION WITH RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION AND ALLOCATION	22
Capital Projects	23
Hiring Prioritization	23
Allocation Responsibility	23
SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION	24
Assessing the Integrated Planning Process.....	24
Assessing Institutional Progress.....	25
CONCLUSION.....	26
APPENDIX A: Multi-Year Integrated Planning Calendar.....	27
APPENDIX B: Sample Progress Update Form.....	29

INTRODUCTION

Integrated planning is an ongoing, systematic process designed to create synergy between various plans and the allocation of resources to ensure that institutional priorities are achieved. A culture of inquiry and data-informed dialogue is central to a planning framework which continuously supports, assesses, and enhances the institution's capacity to provide a highly effective learning environment.

The *ARC Integrated Planning Guide* is intended as a reference which defines the essential components of the planning structure in the context of American River College. The guide includes an overview of the planning processes; highlights governance and planning responsibilities; describes various institutional plans, program review, and annual unit planning; discusses evaluation mechanisms; and provides a clear indication of how planning drives resource allocation. Each individual plan is represented by a fact sheet which can be used independently from the remainder of the guide.

Acknowledgements

During the 2016-17 academic year, American River College embarked upon a strategic planning process that was shaped by three college-wide summits and resulted in a deliberate redesign that is touching every aspect of the institution including its governance and planning

structures. This massive undertaking was a departure from past practice and commenced with the adoption of revised mission and vision statements as well as a formally articulated commitment to social justice and equity.



While it emerged from the ARC Redesign, the *ARC Integrated Planning Guide* builds upon the work of multiple groups. First, the **ARC Program Review Committee** identified a need to refine the existing program review process and defined clear goals to inform the effort. Simultaneously, the **ARC Governance Task Force** developed the *ARC Participatory Governance and Integrated Strategic Planning Framework* which created a streamlined and action-oriented governance structure with capacity to implement the college's strategic plans and oversee its integrated planning processes.

Finally, the **Integrated Planning Improvement Project Team** was formed in 2017-18 and charged with designing a comprehensive institutional planning process that (1) aligns and links all levels of college-wide planning, from strategic and master planning to program review and unit planning; (2) ensures each planning level is integrated, highly effective, and efficient; and (3) incorporates where applicable, effective linkages to resource allocation. Through evaluation of existing systems and substantial dialogue, the project team redesigned the program review and annual unit planning process and formulated the integrated planning structure documented in this guide. Special thanks to the members of the project team for their invaluable input.

Project Team:

Kuldeep Kaur (Chair)
Alisa Shubb (Co-Chair)
Jan DeLapp
Adam Karp
Inna Linnyk
Chris Olson

Rina Roy
Yuj Shimizu
Jeffrey Stephenson
Beth Madigan (Staff Support)
Olga Prizhbilov (Alternate Staff Support)

Project Sponsor: Institutional Effectiveness Council

Project Consultant: Cheri Jones

ARC VISION, MISSION, and COMMITMENT

American River College has a clear vision, mission, and commitment to social justice and equity which guide the work of the college and its employees. The vision and mission are regularly reviewed, and when deemed appropriate, updated to reflect the institution's ongoing promise to cultivate the best interests of its students and nurture the educational attainment of the greater Sacramento region. The institution's strong commitment to social justice and equity defines how its mission is accomplished and the role that the college serves within the local community.

Guiding the Integrated Planning Process

All planning and resource allocation processes at American River College are fundamentally grounded upon the institutional mission. The mission serves as a solid foundation for planning and provides clarity to decisions about resource allocation. The student-centric focus of the mission ensures that student learning and achievement are at the forefront of efforts to enhance institutional effectiveness.

While all planning processes are expected to build upon the stated mission and commitment to social justice and equity, these beliefs rise to the forefront in the program review processes. Participants are directly asked to consider and assess program alignment by responding to the following prompts:

- How does the unit contribute to achievement of the *mission* of American River College?
- How will the unit's intended enhancements support the college's *commitment to social justice and equity*?

Further, all institutional plans are vetted through a governance structure that was deliberately crafted to support strategic planning and which uses the mission and commitment as a mechanism to test the integrity of draft plans prior to adoption.

VISION:

Transform the future of all students and our community through inclusive, equitable education.

MISSION:

American River College places students first in providing an academically rich, inclusive environment that inspires critical thinking, learning and achievement, and responsible participation in the community.

American River College, serving the greater Sacramento region, offers education and support for students to strengthen basic skills, earn associate degrees and certificates, transfer to other colleges and universities, and achieve career as well as other academic and personal goals.

COMMITMENT TO SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EQUITY:

American River College strives to uphold the dignity and humanity of every student and employee. We are committed to equity and social justice through equity-minded education, transformative leadership, and community engagement. We believe this commitment is essential to achieving our mission and enhancing our community.



Adopted May 2017

OVERVIEW OF INTEGRATED PLANNING AT ARC

American River College (ARC) has intentionally designed a systematic and cohesive structure for integrated planning across all levels and aspects of the institution. The structure is based on an ongoing cycle which ensures that each individual planning process can inform, and subsequently be informed, by the work of other planning processes. Resource allocation occurs as a direct result of planning and enables the implementation of planned activities. Evaluation of both the process and the college's progress ensures that integrated planning supports institutional effectiveness.



Figure 1: Overview of ARC Integrated Planning Model

Cohesive Planning, Resource Use, and Evaluation

The integrated planning model used at ARC flows through a continuous sequence of planning followed by resource allocation which enables implementation through which progress can be evaluated as a precursor to more planning. The ARC model hinges upon three primary planning processes at the institutional level that provide analysis as well as the long-range and mid-range guidance necessary to develop cohesive plans for the college and its programs. Building upon the framework of the Institutional Equity Plan, the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan guide the development of multiple institution-level plans focused on topics of strategic importance. ARC currently recognizes a suite of six focused institutional plans.

Primary Plans	Focused Plans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional Equity Plan ▪ Educational Master Plan ▪ Strategic Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distance Education Plan ▪ Facilities Master Plan ▪ Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan ▪ Employee Development and Retention Plan ▪ Sustainability Plan ▪ Technology Master Plan

Relying on qualitative and quantitative data, planning processes are expected to evaluate the current reality and scan the horizon. Based on this assessment, the process develops an intended route to follow and specifies how the institution or program (unit) will navigate towards its desired future. At the program level, planning involves a comprehensive program review at designated intervals and short-term unit planning which occurs on an annual basis. By design, integrated planning processes align goals and objectives across various plans. For example, each action step generated through unit planning is mapped to one or more strategic goals at the institutional level. This intentional mapping ensures that planned activities and resources work synergistically.

Cycles of Planning

The integrated planning cycle is synced to the seven-year accreditation cycle allowing each major plan to be revisited prior to the institution's next self-evaluation. Program review also follows a seven-year cycle with each cohort participating once per cycle. A hiatus from program review and institutional planning is scheduled to coincide with the writing year of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) to ensure that the entire college community can participate and contribute to the self-evaluation process while drawing on a comprehensive set of planning documents to inform evaluative activities.

The full schedule of integrated planning is depicted in a [multi-year planning calendar](#) which is available in Appendix A.

Alignment to District and System Planning

While the mission statement clearly articulates the institution's fundamental purpose, the architecture for integrated planning also acknowledges that the college does not exist in a vacuum. The context for institutional planning is derived from the national, state, regional, and local education landscape as well as the planning efforts of the Los Rios Community College District and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges. As one of the four Los Rios colleges, American River College participates in and influences a variety of district-level planning processes. Information from these planning processes subsequently flows back to the college and is often considered in governance dialogue.

GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY

Shared oversight is a key component of American River College’s integrated processes of institutional planning, program planning, and resource allocation. Responsibility for each of the major planning processes is integrated with, and distributed through, the institution’s redesigned governance structure (shown in Figure 2 below). This intentional design ensures that planning is intertwined with the college’s standard practices and ongoing dialogue.

Each entity within the governance structure has a clear role aligned with its specialized purpose. From a holistic perspective, the distributed model of responsibility leverages the unique expertise of each entity while also sharing accountability for planning and achievement of the institution’s strategic outcomes.

STRATEGIC ♦ STREAMLINED ♦ AGILE ♦ INCLUSIVE ♦ VALUE- AND RESULTS-BASED




Figure 2: ARC Governance Diagram

How It Works in Practice

Each tier of the governance structure serves an important role in institutional planning as noted below in Table 1. For further details on governance roles, please see the full descriptions in the [ARC Governance Framework](#).

Role	Description
Constituency Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Academic Senate - Associated Student Body - Classified Senate - Management Team 	Supplies representatives to the other three tiers of governance (Executive, Council, and Project Team); serves as important stakeholders who offer the benefit of diverse perspectives, actively informs decision-making, and contributes to college planning and implementation efforts
Councils <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) - Operations Council (OC) - Student Success Council (SSC) 	Serves as the sponsor for project teams; considers draft plans and make recommendations to the Executive Leadership Team; monitors progress of planned activities and provides functional direction
Executive Leadership Team (ELT)	Considers recommendations from the councils on draft plans; provides input and final recommendations to the College President in establishing the charters, strategic direction, and accountability of councils and project teams; and ensures transparent communications to and from all governance and constituency groups
President's Executive Staff (PES)	Provides strategic direction and final decision making for all governance and strategic project implementation processes (including implementation of institutional plans); supports the charters established by ELT with councils and project teams
College President	Establishes strategic direction for the college with support of executive staff (PES); retains final decision making authority for the college including decisions regarding institutional planning and resource allocation
Project Teams	Produces specific deliverables (including draft plans) and achieves assigned strategic outcomes within a specified timeframe based on the charge delineated in a project charter
Program Review Committee (subcommittee of the Academic Senate)	Provides operational support for the program review process, coordinates QuEST support, trains program review participants, and evaluates the process

Table 1: Governance Roles

In practice, much of the work involved with development and revision of major plans is delegated to a project team. Each team is sponsored by one of the councils and is chartered by the **College President** in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**. Charters serve to define the scope of work for each project, specify deliverables to be accomplished, set timelines for completing work, clarify boundaries, and provide other detailed guidance. The charters not only establish expectations for the project team, but also provide a mechanism by which the sponsoring council can assess progress. Over the duration of the project, the team participates in a collaborative planning process and develops a draft plan which is subsequently reviewed and adopted through the established governance channels.

Project teams for the upcoming academic year are typically identified and initiated each spring based on the schedule depicted in the [Multi-Year Integrated Planning Calendar](#) (see Appendix A). Project preparation usually occurs over the summer so that each project team is staged to begin the planning process at the start of fall semester. Draft plans are then finished by the end of February to allow sufficient time for governance review in the spring. Once a plan is adopted, units responsible for implementation of first year activities are able to submit resource requests. This typically occur in late spring allowing the requests to be funded prior to adoption of the final budget. Draft plans are also available early enough to allow consideration of potential resource needs during preparation of the tentative budget. See [Figure 3](#) for an overview of how the integrated process typically progresses.



While funding may be allocated from various sources, the **President's Executive Staff (PES)** is responsible for ensuring appropriate resources are available as well as designating an implementation lead or project manager for various planned activities. Councils monitor execution and progress of plans which fall within their chartered responsibility.

Throughout the work, key documents such as the charters, agendas, and meeting notes of project teams, councils, and the ELT are published in the [Institutional Governance Online Repository \(IGOR\)](#). Actions taken are also announced through a governance newsletter that is distributed via email and posted on the college web site. Using these methods, ARC strives for transparency so that the college community can maintain awareness of institutional planning efforts (projects underway), council recommendations, and decisions to adopt draft plans.

ARC IGOR Home Browse▼

Governance Responsibility by Plan

Oversight of each institution-level plan has been assigned to a specific council within the institution's governance structure. Whenever a project team is responsible for development of the plan, the oversight council serves as the sponsor for the project team to provide monitoring, coordination, and support. Draft plans are presented to the **sponsoring (oversight) council** which makes a recommendation to the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**.

The assigned councils and governance review path for each plan is indicated in the chart below.

Planning Document	Oversight	Governance Review Path
Institutional Equity Plan	Institutional Effectiveness Council	Institutional Effectiveness Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Based on existing project charter</i>
Educational Master Plan	Institutional Effectiveness Council	Constituency Groups (all) → Institutional Effectiveness Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>
Strategic Plan	Institutional Effectiveness Council	Constituency Groups (all) → Institutional Effectiveness Council → Executive Leadership Team → Presentation to Governing Board <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>
Distance Education Plan	Student Success Council	Academic Senate → Student Success Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Based on existing project charter</i>
Facilities Master Plan	Operations Council	Operations Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>As this plan is typically developed through a districtwide process, additional review may take place at the district level.</i> <i>Based on existing project charter</i>
Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan	Student Success Council	Student Success Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>
Employee Development and Retention Plan	Institutional Effectiveness Council	Employee Constituency Groups (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Team) → Institutional Effectiveness Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>
Sustainability Plan	Operations Council	Operations Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>
Technology Master Plan	Operations Council	Operations Council → Executive Leadership Team <i>Suggested – Is this the appropriate path?</i>

Table 2: Governance Responsibility by Plan

ARC PLANS

Institutional Equity Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **Executive Leadership Team**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: Institutional Effectiveness Council

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** monitors progress based on these indicators.

Educational Master Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 14 years (with mid-cycle addendum if needed)

Oversight: **Institutional Effectiveness Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** monitors progress based on these indicators.

Strategic Plan

General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]



Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: Unlike other planning processes, ARC’s strategic planning does not have a standardized process involving project teams. The chair of the **Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC)** prompts dialogue regarding the planning process. Based on this dialogue, a recommendation is made to the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)** to either conduct the planning process using a project team approach or other means (e.g., external expertise). Once the approach is determined, the process for development occurs and the draft plan is presented to the **IEC** for consideration. The sponsoring council would then make a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Institutional Effectiveness Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** monitors progress based on these indicators.

Distance Education Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Student Success Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Student Success Council** (oversight council) monitors progress based on these indicators.

Facilities Master Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Operations Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Operations Council** monitors progress based on these indicators.

Strategic Enrollment Management Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Student Success Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Student Success Council** (oversight council) monitors progress based on these indicators.

Employee Development and Retention Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: Institutional Effectiveness Council

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** (oversight council) monitors progress based on these indicators.

Sustainability Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Operations Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Operations Council** (oversight council) monitors progress based on these indicators.

Technology Master Plan



General Description: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample description]

Intended Purpose: [placeholder – content to be added;
pending feedback on sample purpose]

Process for development: The **College President**, in consultation with the **Executive Leadership Team (ELT)**, charts a project team which is charged with development of the plan. The draft plan and any related deliverables are presented to the sponsoring council for consideration. The sponsoring council makes a recommendation to the **ELT**. When appropriate, constituency groups or other stakeholders may be consulted prior to consideration by the sponsoring council. [See [Table 1, Governance Responsibility by Plan](#), for specific details.]

Example Topics: At ARC, plans are often developed based on a project charter which would define the scope including any specific topics. Plans of this type typically explore topics such as:

[placeholder – content to be added; pending feedback on sample topics]

Cycle: Every 7 years

Oversight: **Operations Council**

Expectations or Metrics: Expectations and metrics are defined through the planning process. Once defined, the **Operations Council** (oversight council) monitors progress based on these indicators.

PROGRAM REVIEW AND UNIT PLANNING

Planning at the unit level is another essential component of ARC's integrated planning structure. Focused unit planning is comprised of program review (program-level units only) and annual unit plans (all units) which are embedded in a single, cohesive model. Units use a data-informed approach to regularly assess effectiveness, plan for the future, and request resources to carry out those plans. While considerable emphasis is given to quality enhancement of the planning unit, the entire process is guided by institutional planning to ensure synergistic efforts.




Figure 4: ARC Program Review and Unit Planning Model

ARC developed this model based on a set of guiding principles which reflected an intent to create a supportive, streamlined process that is both meaningful and useful to the participants.

Cyclical Pattern

From the perspective of a single program-level planning unit, the combined model plays out over a seven-year cycle of planning, action, and evaluation of progress. Program review sets the objectives which drive the activities or action steps to which resources are allocated on an annual basis. Updates on progress towards the objectives are collected each year to identify any needed adjustments (course corrections) and the aggregated progress reports serve as the starting point for evaluation at beginning of the next program review cycle.




Figure 5: Seven-Year Cycle for a Program-Level Unit

It should be noted that focused unit planning, which takes place annually, is not restricted to the program-level units which participate in program review. Units at all other levels of the institution may also participate in annual unit planning to specify planned activities and request resources for the upcoming year.

Program Review

Intended Purpose:	Assess program effectiveness and define objectives for program enhancement in alignment with institutional planning
Cycle:	Every 7 years per program
Oversight:	ARC Program Review Committee (Process Coordination) Institutional Effectiveness Council (Integrated Planning and Results)

Coordination of the Program Review Process

Program-level planning units are grouped into cohorts which participate in self-evaluation through program review during an assigned planning year. There is a scheduled hiatus of program review during the year in which the institutional self-evaluation occurs to grant all programs an equitable opportunity to participate in the institutional review.




Figure 6: Program Review Cohorts

One notable characteristic of ARC’s process is the allocation of a cross-functional support team as a resource for each planning unit undergoing comprehensive program review. The use of Quality Enhancement Support Teams (QuEST) demonstrates ARC’s ongoing commitment to maintain high-quality programs and continuously improve institutional effectiveness.

The QuEST process is coordinated through the **Program Review Committee** which is intentionally designed to support and evaluate ARC’s program review processes. As a subcommittee of the **Academic Senate** and working closely with the **Institutional Effectiveness Council**, the **Program Review Committee** is comprised of faculty, classified staff, and administrators who can provide essential technical expertise as well as sharing valuable insight and thoughtful feedback when called upon by the program review participants.

Transparency and Institutional Dialogue

At the end of program review process, each planning unit presents highlights of their program review to a broad audience including members of governance councils, the **Program Review Committee**, and administrators. This mechanism promotes further dialogue and ensures that the information extends beyond individual planning units and their assigned QuEST groups.

The **Institutional Effectiveness Council** formally accepts the program review reports annually.

Annual Unit Planning

Intended Purpose: Identify the short-term action steps and resources by which objectives will be achieved

Cycle: Every year

Oversight: Institutional Effectiveness Council (Integrated Planning and Results)
President's Executive Staff; Operations Council (Resource Allocation and Budget)

Annual unit planning occurs each spring to develop action steps and allocate resources for the upcoming academic year. Action steps are directly linked to goals from ARC's Strategic Plan. This intentional linkage creates a clear connection between institutional planning, unit planning, and resource allocation.

Defining a Planning Unit

Unlike program review which is limited to program-level units, planning units at all levels of the institution participate in the annual unit planning process. A planning unit is an entity that typically exists in the organizational structure and can be allocated resources. Planning unit levels and roles are defined below.

	Role in Annual Unit Planning	Typical Leads	Example
Executive-Level Unit	Identifies action steps and related resource needs to implement strategies or objectives that cross multiple divisions or areas; may include requests for cross-functional initiatives that involve multiple areas	President Vice President Associate Vice President	Instruction
Division/Area-Level Unit	Identifies action steps and related resource needs to implement objectives that cross multiple program-level planning units, but do not extend beyond the division or area	Dean Director	Humanities
Program-Level Unit	Identifies action steps and related resource needs to implement objectives for a program-level planning unit	Department Chair Director Manager Supervisor or designated lead	Foreign Languages

Table 3: Definition of a Planning Unit

Relationship between Program Review and Annual Unit Planning

For program-level planning units, annual unit planning advances the program's objectives into action. One outcome of program review is creating an aspirational vision for the planning unit and one or more objectives which work towards achieving the vision. Annual unit planning identifies the specific action steps the planning unit intends to take during the upcoming year and any resources needed for implementation so that institutional resources can be effectively allocated to planned activities.

INTEGRATION WITH RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION AND ALLOCATION

Resource prioritization and allocation is informed by various institutional planning processes and supplies the necessary resources to carry out planned activities.




Figure 7: Resource Prioritization and Allocation

As mentioned previously, annual unit planning is one of the primary methods by which funding of planned activities occurs and that captures the broadest scope of requests. These resource requests typically support unit-level activities based on program review, but may also include unit-level activities that are necessary to support grant-funded initiatives or institution-level plans (e.g., requests from the Information Technology department to support implementation of the Technology Master Plan). In either case, the activities and resource requests are explicitly aligned to the overarching goals specified in ARC's strategic plan which ensures cohesive efforts across all plans. The unit planning diagram below demonstrates how the continuous cycle enables resource allocation to be driven by planning.




Figure 8: Seven-Year Cycle for a Program-Level Unit

Capital Projects

The Facilities Master Plan (Campus Master Plan) process is integral to outlining the construction plan for new buildings and facility modernization across all campuses of the Los Rios Community College District. Once the Facilities Master Plan has been developed, resources are allocated from the District's General Obligation Bond and/or state bonds. Allocations for deferred maintenance may also come from District sources.

Hiring Prioritization

Another aspect that influences how resources are distributed is the hiring prioritization processes for the allocation of permanent personnel (new positions). While hiring prioritization is indirectly informed by program review and institutional planning, separate mechanisms have been established to determine the highest priorities for hiring. These processes are scheduled with regard to anticipated hiring timelines for permanent positions, particularly those faculty hires which must be in place for the next academic year. The exact timing of hiring prioritization may vary slightly, but generally follows the timeline described below.

Faculty Hiring

September	Request process opens
October	Requests are generated; related data is compiled by the ARC Research Office
November	Submitted requests go to Academic Senate for review; presentations are held; ranking of requested positions is sent to the College President
December	College President publishes the list of approved (funded) positions
Spring semester	Hiring process occurs for anticipated start in the fall

Staff Hiring

September-October	Potential staffing needs and/or "critical hires" identified through the annual unit planning process; deans and supervisors are asked to complete a screening application
November	Classified Senate screening committee reviews applications, participates in presentations, and ranks the requests based on established screening criteria; report is compiled and recommendations are forwarded to the President's Executive Staff (PES)
December	College President publishes the list of approved (funded) positions
Spring semester	Hiring process occurs as appropriate to fill positions in a timely manner

Table 4: Faculty and Staff Hiring Prioritization

Allocation Responsibility

The primary responsibility for allocating resources based on planning processes lies with members of the **President's Executive Staff (PES)** in conjunction with budget managers of categorical/grant-funded programs. Once resource requests are submitted by initiators and their supervising administrators, the **PES** discusses the prioritized requests, available funding, and potential funding sources. From April to August of each year, requests are designated for funding through the tentative and final budgets. This occurs as the College President and vice-presidents (who serve on **PES**) allocate resources to individual items in the areas they oversee. If additional funds become available after the final budget, unfunded requests are reviewed to determine how new funding can best be allocated to the remaining needs.

The **Operations Council** provides ongoing leadership for the oversight of resources for various professional development activities (faculty, classified staff, and management) and is also charged with reviewing funded priorities associated with college planning and resource allocation.

SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION

Note: It was mentioned at the 10/12 meeting that further input is needed from PES, IEC, and ELT regarding how planning and plans should be evaluated. The text in the following section may need revision once that input is received.

Embedded within and across all planning processes is a systematic cycle of evaluation. In order to fully consider its effectiveness, American River College regularly assesses both (1) its *process* and (2) its *progress*. Each major planning process is overseen by a specific entity within the governance structure which serves as the foundation for ongoing evaluation and accountability related to the specific plan. Further, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC)** assumes responsibility for the overall evaluation of the integrated planning process and the **Executive Leadership Team** holistically monitors the annual progress of all plans.

Evaluation Area	Oversight	Methods
Integrated Planning Process	Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual feedback from membership of ELT and the three councils via surveys or other methods Cyclical review and update of the Integrated Planning Guide to examine the process as a whole
Program Review Process	Program Review Committee (subcommittee of the Academic Senate) and the Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of informal feedback collected via the QuEST process Receipt of Program Review Reports by the Institutional Effectiveness Council
Progress on Major Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional Equity Plan - Educational Master Plan - Strategic Plan 	Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular progress updates from those involved in implementation Regular review of college-wide indicators (data)
Progress on Focused Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distance Education Plan - Employee Development and Retention Plan - Strategic Enrollment Management Plan - Sustainability Plan - Technology Master Plan 	Council which has oversight for the plan (see Table 2 for details)	Regular progress updates from those involved in implementation of plans
Oversight of All Plans	Executive Leadership Team	Annual progress update to ELT from council chairs (see sample form in Appendix B)
Alignment of Resource Allocation	Operations Council (OC)	Annual report received after final budget is adopted

Table 5: Evaluation Oversight and Methods

Assessing the Integrated Planning Process

On an annual basis, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** solicits feedback from the membership of the Executive Leadership Team and the three chartered councils. The feedback may be collected via a set of questions included in a general governance survey or through other methods. Findings are discussed within the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** and considered more broadly when additional dialogue is needed to assess the results and determine potential improvements.

Additionally, the **Institutional Effectiveness Council** conducts a cyclical review of the content of this Integrated Planning Guide in order to intentionally seek opportunities to clarify and enhance the institution's integrated planning process. This review is informed by the most recent survey results and other input. The review schedule is depicted in the [Multi-Year Calendar](#) provided in Appendix A.

Assessing Institutional Progress

Once a plan is adopted, one of the councils is expected to monitor execution of the plan over multiple years. The council receives progress updates from the individual(s) charged with implementation and provides functional guidance when needed. At the end of each academic year, the council chairs summarize the progress on each plan in a brief report to the **Executive Leadership Team** (see [sample form](#) in Appendix B). The **Executive Leadership Team** is then able to consider how the work across all plans is cohesively contributing towards achievement of ARC's strategic goals.

The **Institutional Effectiveness Council** regularly reviews key metrics which indicate the institution's progress across relevant indicators. Additionally, there are many accountability mechanisms by which progress is regularly measured and communicated to stakeholders of public institutions. Three vehicles used to showcase ARC's institutional progress are:

Institutional Self-Evaluation Report and Institution-Set Standards

Every seven years, the college evaluates and documents its effectiveness through the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) which is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The college also measures its performance level for student achievement indicators against institution-set standards and strives towards a stretch goal for each indicator. The methodology used recognizes statistically significant increases and/or declines in performance.

Program Self-Evaluation and Department-Set Standards

Through program reviews, each program-level planning unit conducts a comprehensive self-evaluation and assesses its own progress over the last cycle. Each year, academic departments also review their department-set standards (i.e., institution-set standards at the department level) which prompts dialogue and when appropriate, action. Program-level planning units also regularly review progress related to student learning outcomes and student service outcomes. Programs which exceed their stretch goals are celebrated for their progress.

Institutional Research

On an ongoing basis, the **ARC Research Office** monitors and publishes a variety of metrics and key performance indicators for the institution along with disaggregation by subpopulation.

MOVING THE NEEDLE

The latest data indicates that twelve programs not only met their department set standard, but also exceeded their stretch goal (statistically significant increase). Based on a three-year average, these indicators are used to monitor program-level progress over time by identifying significant increases and decreases in course success rates. Results are communicated to celebrate achievement and prompt further dialogue in support of ARC's ongoing efforts to improve student success.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS:

Accounting	Journalism
Automotive Diesel	Music
Dietary Management	Nutrition and Foods
English	Philosophy
Funeral Services	Political Science
Gerontology	Sign Language Interpreter Studies

Wondering about your department? Check your progress by visiting:
https://emp.arc.boston.edu/login_is.asp

ARC

FORWARD MOTION: STRATEGIC • STREAMLINED • AGILE • INCLUSIVE • VALUE-AND RESULTS-BASED

GOVERNANCE HIGHLIGHTS

CONCLUSION

The integrated planning process is intended to ensure that adopted plans are actualized so that the college moves forward on the intended path. First, each of the college's plans are broadly communicated through the constituency representation of its councils as well as directly to stakeholders via the ARC web site. The *ARC Integrated Planning Guide* and all of the institutional plans described herein are posted on a comprehensive integrated planning web page to ensure the information is disseminated and readily available to the campus community.

Next, execution of the plans is prompted by the **President's Executive Staff** which determines how to implement, assigns responsibilities, ensures resources, and supports other decision-making required to operationalize each plan.

Finally, the institutional governance structure supplies ongoing monitoring and assessment of planned activities to ensure that the indicated goals, objectives, and strategic outcomes are realized.

APPENDIX A: Multi-Year Integrated Planning Calendar

The calendar below is synced to the 7-year accreditation cycle. Initial development of plans is compressed in order to have the full set of evidence by 2021. The regular schedule for integrated planning begins in 2022.

Plan or Activity	Cycle	First full cycle on regular schedule														
		16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29	29-30	30-31
Accreditation	7 years	Write Follow-up	Write Midterm Report	Midterm Report <i>Due FA 18</i>		Prep for ISER	Write the ISER	Site Visit (2022)		Write Midterm Report	Midterm Report Due		Prep for ISER	Write the ISER	Site Visit (2029)	
Vision-Mission-Values Review	7 years	Done						Review (2023-31)							Review (2030-36)	
Institutional Equity Plan	7 years			New ¹ (2019-23)					Develop (2024-30)							Develop (2031-37)
Educational Master Plan	14 years			New ¹ (2019-31)					Review*							Develop (2031-44)
Strategic Plan	7 years	Done (2017-21)				Extend to 2024				Develop (2025-31)						
Distance Education Plan	7 years			Develop (2019-25)							Develop (2026-32)					
Employee Dev. & Retention Plan	7 years			In Progress ²	In Progress ²	New ² (2021-37)							Develop (2028-34)			
Enrollment Mgmt. Plan (SEM)	7 years			New (2019-25)							Develop (2026-32)					
Facilities Master Plan	7 years			Develop ¹ (2019-26)								Develop (2027-33)				
Sustainability Plan	7 years			New ¹ (2019-24)						Develop (2025-31)						
Technology Master Plan	7 years				Develop (2020-26)							Develop (2027-33)				
Program Review	7 years	Group B	Group C	Group D	Group E	Group F	(hiatus)	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Group E	Group F	(hiatus)	Group A	Group B
Annual Unit Planning	Annual	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process	Annual Process
Employee Survey (college-wide)	Varies	District and College surveys conducted prior to the ISER; additional college surveys conducted as needed						District and College surveys conducted prior to the ISER; additional college surveys conducted as needed								
Student Survey/CCSSE	Varies	CCSSE, SENSE, and/or other student surveys conducted on a regular basis						CCSSE, SENSE, and/or other student surveys conducted on a regular basis								
Assessment of Program Review	Ongoing	n/a	Full Review	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	Full Review	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback	QuEST Feedback
Assessment of Integrated Planning	See note ³	n/a	n/a	IPG Adoption	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	IPG Full Review	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	Council Feedback	IPG Full Review	Council Feedback

¹ Off-cycle plan; future plans will follow the regular schedule and range of years.

² Work has already been done on a professional development plan which can serve as initial research to be further framed through the lens of the Institutional Equity Plan. A phased approach is suggested which would focus on professional development in the first year, employee onboarding in the second year, and employee retention/succession planning in the third year which could then be compiled into a complete plan.

³ The councils are generally chartered for three years. Annual feedback would be followed by a full review of integrated planning in the final year of each IEC charter.

The regular cycle of planning is configured to ensure all plans are revisited during each seven-year accreditation cycle and that planning documents are available as a resource while the institution examines its effectiveness through the process of institutional self-evaluation.

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Accreditation Site Visit			Midterm Report		Prepare for ISER (Self-Evaluation)	Write the ISER (Self-Evaluation)
Review of Vision and Mission	Institutional Equity Plan Educational Master Plan <i>(Full development every 14 years; addendum if needed at midpoint)</i>	Strategic Plan Sustainability Plan	Distance Education Plan Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan	Facilities Master Plan Technology Master Plan	Employee Development & Retention Plan	
Program Review Cohort A	Program Review Cohort B	Program Review Cohort C	Program Review Cohort D	Program Review Cohort E	Program Review Cohort F	(hiatus)

APPENDIX B: Sample Progress Update Form

The Executive Leadership Team receives updates annually from the councils on the progress of plan implementation. The form below is intended as a sample of the level and types of information to be reported.



Annual Update on Plan Implementation

Institutional Plan: [Select Plan]

Academic Year:

Sponsoring Council: [Select Council]

Submitted to the ELT by:

Brief Summary of Planned Activities and Progress:

Accomplishments and Kudos:

Comments: