A review of the PIE summaries for the 2006-07 academic year indicates a significant improvement in alignment of unit goals with college goals as compared to the 2005-06 process. If we look at the Current Focus Goals, we can note strong involvement around the campus, particularly in the goals reported by the academic departments. A tally of goal alignment for Current Focus Goals reveals this involvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Focus Goal</th>
<th>Academic Departments</th>
<th>Other Departments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. The College will secure funding that supports exemplary programs and services.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The College will prepare students to be critically thinking, socially, culturally, and politically responsible citizens through the development of exemplary programs.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The College will improve career/vocational training opportunities to help students maintain professional currency and achieve individual goals.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The College will improve the quality of its partnerships with business and industry, the community, and other educational institutions.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. The College will utilize technology to enhance teaching and learning to provide support for educational programs.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The College will provide an environment for consciousness of diversity while also providing opportunities for increased diversity and equity for all across campus.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we are able to report at this time is the relative responsiveness of the departments in aligning their work with College goals. (It is important to note when reviewing the “Breakdown of Department Goals Connected to College Goals” which is attached to this Summary for greater specificity in reporting unit-level planning that the first listing of goals created by academic department is not comprehensive. Only selected examples are included to convey the kind of goals reported by academic departments.) If the number of goals can be considered a significant factor, then we will see that the strongest involvement is for goal H, a goal that departments across campus have focused on for their own planning and progress. We also see strong interest in
academic departments in helping the college establish progress for goal D. Goal I has the fewest
goals aligned to it, but we do see departments across the campus developing activities to help the
College make progress on diversity measures. While we do not yet have consistent data that
enable us to quantify progress toward many of the goals identified in team summary reports, we
can see from the data provided that alignment and focus across the campus, particularly in the
academic departments for the Current Focus Goals, suggest that departments are working
diligently at planning activities that will help the College establish progress.

For the Ongoing Goals, we see very different responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Goal</th>
<th>Academic Departments</th>
<th>Other Departments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.  The College will provide a risk-free environment for the measurement of SLOs under the umbrella of Planning for Institutional Effectiveness.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.  The College will become a nationally recognized institution of higher education that embraces an atmosphere of self-reflective dialogue in making policies and plans and in communication.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.  The College will provide a risk-free environment for the measurement of AUOs related to Planning for Institutional Effectiveness.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.  The College will embrace an environment of mutual respect and integrity that encourages the exchange of ideas and acknowledges and values contributions made by members of the College community.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers show us that few departments have developed goals or activities in alignment with these goals. They suggest that our revision of College goals for 2007-08 is sensible in that we have made changes in our institutional goals that enable us to work together in establishing progress in areas of common value.

A component added for 2006-07 to the PIE process was the option of reporting goals not aligned with College goals. In the summaries submitted by the various teams we are able to see a much richer definition of the goal-setting across the campus, particularly for the departments whose work is not focused primarily in classroom instruction or direct contact with students. The goals reported on the summaries fall into several categories identified below.

1. Improve facilities in support of instructional programs 7 goals
2. Strengthen academic programs 4 goals
3. Program promotion/student recruitment  8 goals
4. Increase student access and success  25 goals
5. Support faculty involvement outside the classroom  5 goals
6. Provide professional development activities  5 goals
7. Address student basic skills needs  8 goals
8. Improve services to the campus  52 goals
9. Improve campus environment  15 goals

As we look at this list, we see identified some critical areas of support for instructional programs that allow the College to show the focus for planning for departments across teams. Of particular significance are the areas of increasing student access and success, improving the campus environment, and improving service to the campus. The later goal category was the most important planning focus for departments whose function it is to ensure a well-functioning institution.

Assessing Compliance with ACCJC Expectations for Effectiveness in Program Review

As the Institutional Effectiveness Committee members have reviewed the PIE summaries from 2006-07, we have considered our process in the context of the ACCJC rubric for institutional effectiveness, parts of which are brought here for consideration.

ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review: Proficiency

1. Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.
2. Results of all program review are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.
3. The program review framework is established and implemented.
4. Dialogue about the results of all program review is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.
5. Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.
6. The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.

In terms of proficiency, the IEC believes we have established criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4. Our PIE process is implemented regularly, and unit planning as it is represented in the PIE report is used for requesting resources through the budget processes. The IEC has posted results of the PIE review process on its website, and all managers have been encouraged regularly to communicate with unit members about PIE, both as a collaborative planning guide for the unit itself, and as a process that allows the unit to communicate its needs to the institution. On criteria 5 and 6, we could strengthen our process by establishing an explicit link between program review and institutional resources and resource allocation processes. The IEC has proposed some changes.
in PIE for 2007-08 to make this link stronger. Additionally, we need to strengthen the connection between program review and processes that improve student achievement and student learning outcomes. Although SLOs (and AUOs) are required for PIE, 2007-08 will be the first year in which all departments are required to have completed an assessment cycle. Until departments are continuously documenting complete assessment cycles, it will be difficult for us to tie institutional planning to results of SLO assessment that enable us to improve student achievement.

**ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review: Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement**

1. Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
2. The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
3. The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

On the dimension of meeting criteria set by the ACCJC for establishing sustainable continuous quality improvement, it appears at this time that we are meeting criteria #2. The IEC has looked closely at the program review forms and processes in terms of their effectiveness in helping us to improve institutional effectiveness and has made some recommendations for improvements that are intended to improve effectiveness. As with the proficiency criteria, criteria 1 and 2 depend upon our clearly establishing ongoing, full assessment cycles so that we have data that we can directly connect from PIE for the improvement of student learning and achievement.

It is our belief that all departments on campus are focused on goals that contribute, directly or indirectly, to the improvement of student learning and achievement. The institution as a whole is learning to use data that has been collected, through outcomes assessment or through the implementation of unit goals, to improve institutional functioning. It is the hope of the IEC that for next year we will be able to bring documentation in our report that establishes a stronger link between program-level planning in PIE and the allocation of resources at the College.