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- Data-driven
- Effective Planning
- Clear Decisions
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ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE
SEQUOIAS CCD

MISSION

Commencing in September 2014, the Mission is reviewed every three years by the District Governance Senate and is either reaffirmed or revised. A task force, convened by the District Governance Senate:

- solicits and compiles District-wide feedback;
- reviews any relevant data;
- considers emergent trends in higher education and/or recent legislation; and,
- recommends reaffirmation or revision of the Mission to the District Governance Senate.

The District Governance Senate considers the District feedback, relevant data and the recommendation for reaffirmation or revision by the task force. Ratification of the existing Mission Statement or any revisions will be made by a majority vote of the District Governance Senate and the final recommendation will be forwarded to the Superintendent/President.

If the Superintendent/President does not approve of the recommendation for reaffirmation or revision, the District Governance Senate and the Superintendent/President shall continue to collaborate and compromise until an agreement is achieved.

The Superintendent/President presents either the proposed revision or reaffirmation of the Mission Statement to the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Process details are outlined in the Integrated Planning Manual, approved by the Board of Trustees in August 2013.

Reference: Board Policy 1200
WASC/ACCJC Accreditation Standard I

Board Approved: February 13, 2012
Revised: March 10, 2014
## Timeline and Process for Reviewing the District Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>The Superintendent/President requests that the District Governance Senate Co-chairs initiate a review of the District Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Co-chairs convene a task force and directs them to:

1. Develop a process to solicit District-wide feedback about the current mission;
2. Review relevant quantitative and qualitative data as well as emergent trends in higher education and/or recent legislation; and
3. Based on that feedback and new information make recommendations regarding the current mission statement.

The task force:

1. Develops a process for gathering District-wide feedback and submits the proposed process to the District Governance Senate for review and comment; and
2. Identifies the specific data elements and information for the District Governance Senate to review.
Mission Assessed!

Per the District Governance manual, a task force was appointed to review the District Mission statement. Report from DGS Task Force on Review of Mission Statement.

- The task force met 2 times and exchanged numerous emails. A survey was sent out for District wide feedback via COS Enews. The survey results were obtained between Sept 15-Oct 1, 2017.
- There were 126 respondents.
  - 33% Full time faculty
  - 9% Adjunct faculty
  - 35% Classified/confidential
  - 13% Administration
  - 1% Students
  - 6% Community members
  - 2% COS Board Members
- The data indicates the mission statement should be shorted. Therefore, the task force is providing DGS three options. We recommend the first option.
- Three options were presented to District Governance on Tuesday, Nov 28, 2017 and after a discussion, additional recommendations were made.
• External and Internal Scanning
• Regional population trends and demographics
• Local economic trends
• Enrollment trends
• Student demographics
• Student outcomes
• Perceptions
One Mission
Goals: 4
Objectives: 10
Actions: 36
- Vision Goals (VfS)
- Master Plan
- Strategic Plan
- Equity Plan
- Program Outcomes
- Stretch Goals
- Minimum Standards
- IEPI Goals

Guided Pathways
Guiding Principles for Setting Standards, Goals and Objectives

- Reasonable
- Appropriate
- Realistic

Sspecific, Mmeasurable, Aattainable, Rrelevant, and Ttime-bound

Determine performance indicators based on data analysis, institutional priorities, history and context.
What’s in the Assessment Plan?

- Assessment
- Measure
- Definition
- Methodology
- Data Source
- Alternative Sources of Data
- Data Availability Date
- Footnotes/caveats
- Rationale
District Objective 1.1: The District will increase FTES 1.75% over the three years.

Assessment: Review and compare annual FTES baseline data over the next three years.

Measure (list measures that will be used in the assessment):
- Academic year, FTES count and percent change

Definition:
- Annual FTES is defined as summer, fall, spring
- Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES): Full-Time Equivalency generated by both full-time and part-time students. One FTES represents 525 class (contact) hours or student instruction/activity. The figure 525 is derived from the fact that 35 weeks of instruction are required each year and a student attending 15 hours per week for 35 weeks will be in attendance for 525 hours.

Methodology: EIS report FTES Analysis provides data by term. Summer, fall, and spring terms are combined for the annual FTES count.

Data Source: COS EIS report FTES Analysis

Data Availability Date (timeframe): Several weeks after the semester ends

Alternative Sources of Data (as applicable): Data Mart

Footnotes/caveats: It is not recommended to reference the 320 report or IPEDS for this assessment.

Rationale (if any): FTES is the best indicator to capture student enrollment changes.
• PR is part of the planning model that promotes a culture of data analysis

• PR Assessment is a data driven model for others to follow

• Embeds data analysis into the culture of committee reports

• Make data available and easy to locate
Program Review Elements

- **Program Summary** –
  - STRENGTHS of the unit; includes course success; productivity, FTES, FTEF
  - Areas of IMPROVEMENT; data driven
  - SLO ASSESSMENTS/SAO assessments
  - Changes based on SLO/SAO assessments

- **ACTIONS** – one year

- **RESORUCE requests if needed to fund actions**
Four data metrics are displayed:

- Success
- Productivity
- FTES (Full-time Equivalent Students)
- FTEF (Full-time Equivalent Faculty)

Three years of data are displayed (Fall and Spring)

Unit totals are shown

Top 5 enrolled courses in the unit are shown
PR Training – How to use Data for PR

- PR Annual Training Schedule
- PR resources on website – online modules
- PR Training Manual
- PR examples from previous year available online

- One place on the college website
Assessment of PR – Annual Survey

- The material presented in the training was easy to follow and understand.
  - Strongly Agree: 50% (2), Agree: 50% (2), Disagree: 0% (0), Strongly Disagree: 0% (0), Total: 4.

- The amount of material presented in the training was appropriate and reasonable.
  - Strongly Agree: 50% (2), Agree: 50% (2), Disagree: 0% (0), Strongly Disagree: 0% (0), Total: 4.

- The material presented in the training was helpful to me.
  - Strongly Agree: 50% (2), Agree: 50% (2), Disagree: 0% (0), Strongly Disagree: 0% (0), Total: 4.

- The material presented in the training is applicable to my work area.
  - Strongly Agree: 50% (2), Agree: 25% (1), Disagree: 25% (1), Strongly Disagree: 0% (0), Total: 4.

- The material presented in the training is relevant and useful to my professional development.
  - Strongly Agree: 50% (2), Agree: 50% (2), Disagree: 0% (0), Strongly Disagree: 0% (0), Total: 4.
**PR Audit Form/2018**

Use the questions below to evaluate your Unit’s responses within program review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the Unit address elements of Institutional Effectiveness in its discussion of the unit’s <strong>strengths</strong>? These may include <em>Academic Quality, Student Success, Resource Efficiency, Internal Relations, and External Relations</em> as described in the <em>TracDat Manual</em>.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the Unit utilize/analyze data to support claims made in the discussion of its <strong>strengths</strong>?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the Unit utilize/analyze data to support its conclusions regarding <strong>improvements</strong>?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do the needed <strong>improvements</strong> follow logically from an analysis of achievement and assessment data and/or identified external opportunities/challenges?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the Unit address all applicable outcome levels in their discussion of <strong>overall outcome achievement</strong>?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has the unit uploaded the assessment data referenced in response to the <strong>overall outcome achievement</strong> prompt?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the uploaded assessment data complete (i.e. account for all applicable outcome levels)?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are changes based on <strong>outcome achievement</strong> grounded in the Unit’s assessment data and/or the Unit’s identified strengths or weaknesses?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the Unit evaluate its outcomes cycle of assessment (rather than simply provide a description of the cycle)?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the Unit’s Actions able to be completed in one year?</td>
<td>All / Most / Some / None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are the Unit’s Actions specific?</td>
<td>All / Most / Some / None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are the Unit’s Actions measurable?</td>
<td>All / Most / Some / None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is the rationale for each of the Unit’s Actions clearly connected to the Unit’s strengths, needs and/or challenges?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do resource requests clearly support the Action(s) that they are linked to?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Review Audit – another source of data
Q11 Please indicate your level of agreement:

Answered: 98  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Unit utilizes/analyzes data to support claims made in the discussion of its strengths.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Unit utilizes/analyzes data to support its conclusions regarding needed improvements.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Review
Audit – another source of data
1. The program review process was easy to follow.
2. The program review process required little effort to complete.
3. The program review process was beneficial to my program.
### Example of data provided to each Academic Unit

#### College of the Sequoias Program Review Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Success</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept.</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 020</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 021</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 030</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 031</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 040</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success Rate:** (Letter grades A, B, C, P / all grades issued) Plus and minus grades are included. Students who receive a grade but were not enrolled at census are not included in this ratio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept.</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 020</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>17.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 021</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 030</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 031</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>23.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 040</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>18.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Productivity:** FTES/FTE, with 17.5 being the expected productivity level. 17.5 is derived from the ratio, FTES/FTE, or 525/30 = 17.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept.</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>427.67</td>
<td>452.43</td>
<td>495.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 020</td>
<td>109.80</td>
<td>108.60</td>
<td>117.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 021</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 030</td>
<td>116.20</td>
<td>137.00</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 031</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 040</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>75.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept.</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>25.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 020</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 021</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 030</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 031</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 040</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You can never have too much Data!

- What other data is available?
  - Course data for Courses that were not your top 5 enrolled courses
  - Data for all courses can be disaggregated for:
    - Campus
    - Instruction Type
    - Race/Ethnicity
    - Gender
  - District totals for the data
  - State-wide data for your area
    - Data for specific Districts
    - State system aggregate data
Tableau

- Program Review Dashboard
  (https://tinyurl.com/COS-ProgramReview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Rate Details</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Total</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 002 Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Total</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 002</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COS 2.0 - Designed for Integration
Resource Allocation at College of the Sequoias
Unrestricted Funds – allocation can be looked at as a three-legged stool:

**PROGRAM REVIEW – ONE-TIME FUNDS**
- ABOVE BASE Resource allocation process per Resource Allocation Manual
- Funding for needs that align with Goals and Objectives ($500+)
  - Requested in Program Review – by October 15
  - Ranked by IC* and Service Areas in November
  - Ranked by Budget Committee in February
  - Reviewed by DGS* and approved in March
  - Budgeted by March 31
  - Spent by June 30
- Or: Instructional Equipment Funds
  - Annual amounts vary
  - Ranked by IC* in November
  - Granted in spring

**BASE BUDGET** – Prior year department and division budgets are rolled forward (except in years of fiscal crisis, when cuts may occur)

**ONGOING BASE BUDGET AUGMENTATION per AP 3261 Process:**
- Requested by Divisions or Departments in February
- Prioritized by Service Area Administrators in early March
- Prioritized lists are ranked by Senior Management in March
- President presents his/her final prioritized list to DGS* for feedback in April
- Augmentations are authorized by President in May for the following year

All Resource Allocation Requests will include rationale and evidence that link to District Mission, Goals, Objectives, SAO’s and/or SLO’s

In addition:
- Occasionally, large ONE-TIME unrestricted resources/funds become available to the General Fund (start and end dates vary):
  - VP Administration and President will draft expenditure proposal
  - Budget Committee will review, revise, and approve
  - Senior Management will review with affected administrators and constituents, revise, and approve
  - Budget committee will review again and approve
  - DGS* will review and approve
  - Board will review draft, then approve at the following Board meeting

---

* IC = Instructional Council
* DGS = District Governance Senate
** Resource allocations can also be made outside of program review to meet strategic plan goals per Resource Allocation Manual
## How to request base budget augmentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Budget Requested</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Link to District Outcomes, Objectives, Goal or Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Description and Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10000-20000 Hourly, Student Help, Stipends, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43000 Instructional Supplies &amp; Materials, to Duplication/Print Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44000 Non-Instructional Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51100-51200 Contract Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51400 Dues &amp; Memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51500-51900 Legal, Audit, Advertisements or Personal &amp; Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52000-52050 Travel &amp; Conference or Work Related Mileage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52100-52200 Equipment Rental/Lease or Repairs/ Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60000 Capital Outlay/ Capital Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding request is linked to District Objectives through its associated action</td>
<td>Demonstrates significant link to District Objectives</td>
<td>Demonstrates moderate link to District Objectives</td>
<td>Demonstrates poor connection to District Objectives</td>
<td>Demonstrates no connection to District Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The action linked to the funding request is related to course/program/department outcomes.</td>
<td>Demonstrates significant link to multiple course/program/department outcomes</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear link to a course/program/department outcome</td>
<td>Demonstrates weak link to course/program/department outcome</td>
<td>Demonstrates no link to course/program/department outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource request is connected to achieving the action</td>
<td>Demonstrates significant need for the achievement of the action</td>
<td>Demonstrates moderate need for the achievement of the action</td>
<td>Demonstrates minimal need for the achievement of the action</td>
<td>Demonstrates no need for the achievement of the action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data supports the rationale for the action and need for resource request</td>
<td>Data significantly supports rationale for the action and need for resource request</td>
<td>Data moderately supports rationale for the action and need for resource request</td>
<td>Minimal data present with no clear connection to rationale for the action and need for resource request</td>
<td>No connection to rationale for the action or need for resource request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding request has been ranked by Service Area</td>
<td>Demonstrates a high ranking in the top quartile by specific Service Area</td>
<td>Demonstrates a ranking in the second quartile by specific Service Area</td>
<td>Demonstrates a ranking in the third quartile by specific Service Area</td>
<td>Demonstrates a ranking in the bottom quartile by specific Service Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Committee memo: Assessment of Above Base Resource Allocation

You were awarded a spring 2018 resource allocation for your above-base funding request. The Above Base Resource Allocation was approved for:

________________________________________________________________________

Please provide the Budget Committee with the following information regarding this resource allocation.

The outcome considers student need and effective practices, provides a significant benefit to multiple departments/district-wide, and/or is linked to Institutional (District) Objectives as stated in the Program Review.

What District Goal(s), Objective(s), and/or Dept/Division Outcome(s) did this request link to in the original Program Review (please list Goal/Objective # and description)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
How has the funding allocation helped your division or department further achieve its objective(s) or outcome(s)?

This resource allocation accomplished the following measurable outcome(s) since summer 2018:

Additional data was collected and measured by:

Please forward questions to: Christine Statton, chair, or Michael Skaff, vice-chair
Please return from by April 22, 2019. Again, congratulations! The Budget Committee.
Annual Assessment Memo (One-time Funds)

Department (Sample) Architecture

Dear (division chair or program review author) (name)

In fall 2018 you were awarded $9,800 to purchase or procure a large format scanner

1. How has the funding allocation helped your division or department further achieve its objective(s) or outcome(s)

2. On a scale of 1-5 (5 being the most), how effective has the resource allocation been to achieve the intended goal? (circle one)

   1   2   3   4   5

3. Please share any additional information or data collected:

Please return this to Instructional Council via the Academic Services Office (VP) by __________________.
This report includes three parts:

1. Update on the actions completed from Fall 2017 through Spring 2018 related to each objective

2. Analysis of the District’s movement toward achieving its goals

3. Identification of the Actions to be completed next year
District Goal: A District Goal from the Master Plan will be listed here.

District Objective 1.1
The specific strategies to be implemented to work toward achievement of the District Goals. District Objectives are measurable, specific, and attainable.

Assessment of District Objective 1.1:
Identify the specific way that this District Objective will be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action for District Objective 1.1</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Implications for Next Year’s Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. The information in this column identifies the specific steps to be taken to fulfill the District Objective.</td>
<td>The information in this column identifies the group or office responsible to launch and oversee completion of the Action.</td>
<td>The information in this column sets the target date for completing this Action.</td>
<td>The information in this column will be completed as part of the development of the Annual College Report on the Master Plan and is a brief statement describing the status of the Action.</td>
<td>This column is completed during the development of the Annual College Report on the Master Plan when the outcome described in the previous column requires an adjustment to subsequent Actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Progress** is a *brief* statement describing the results of the Actions. Submissions should be concise, factual, and relevant to the specified Action. An example is included below for your reference. IPEC does not need intricate details or dates; a summary will suffice. Progress statements should address:
   - Was the Action completed? – Yes or No
   - If yes, how was the Action completed?
   - If no, what progress has been made towards completing the Action?

2. **Implications for Next Year’s Action Plans** describe adjustments that may be needed if the progress described in the previous column requires changes to subsequent Actions.
### Example Submissions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2.3</strong> Develop an evaluation instrument/form for training sessions provided.</td>
<td>The instrument/evaluation form for District trainings and workshops was developed. The instrument was tested and administered with the new Department Chair workshop and training. The process for use of the evaluation form was communicated District wide.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1.1</strong> Develop and implement an informational campaign for students on CSU and UC pathways (Associate Degrees for Transfer (AA-T/AS-T) and Transfer Agreement Guarantees (TAG)).</td>
<td>A comprehensive outreach campaign is conducted annually that includes distribution of printed promotional materials and presentations to feeder high school districts, student groups and parents, as well as business, industry and community partners.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Goal #1: Current Snapshot

District Objective 1.1:
Increase enrollment by 1.75% annually.

Annual Headcount and FTES Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datamart FTES</td>
<td>10,965</td>
<td>9,147</td>
<td>8,712</td>
<td>8,984</td>
<td>8,955</td>
<td>9,429</td>
<td>9,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datamart Headcount</td>
<td>18,819</td>
<td>14,902</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,062</td>
<td>14,291</td>
<td>15,089</td>
<td>15,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-20.8%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community College Chancellor's Office

For the 2016-17 year, the annual headcount increased by 3.1% compared to the 2015-16 year while the full-time equivalent students (FTES) count increased by 5% during the same period.
District Goal #3: Current Snapshot

District Objective 3.1:

Reduce the achievement gap of disproportionately impacted student groups, as identified in the Student Equity Plan annually.

DIG: Disproportionately Impacted student Groups

178
All Groups

149
Almost/At or Above Equity

11
Below Equity

18
Far Below Equity
This College of the Sequoias End-of-Cycle Report assesses the progress made toward achieving the goals and objectives of the 2015-2018 Strategic Plan.
**District Goal #2. Improve the rate at which its students complete degrees, certificates, and transfer objectives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Objective #2</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1.1 Develop and implement an informational campaign for students on CSU and UC pathways (Associate Degrees for Transfer (AA-T/AS-T) and Transfer Agreement Guarantees (TAG)). | Superintendent/President, Vice President, Student Services, and Marketing/Public Info Coordinator | 2015-2016: A comprehensive outreach campaign is conducted annually that includes distribution of printed promotional materials and presentations to feeder high school districts, student groups and parents, as well as business, industry and community partners.  
2016-2017: A comprehensive outreach campaign is conducted annually that includes distribution of printed promotional materials and presentations to feeder high school districts, student groups and parents, as well as business, industry and community partners.  
2017-2018: This action has been completed in 2016-2017 and the practice has been institutionalized. | End of Cycle: This action was completed in 2016-2017 and the practice is institutionalized. This cycle has greatly evolved over the course of the past three years, beginning with a marketing campaign to publicize transfer pathways and culminating with the addition of several new Associate Degrees for Transfer and new partnerships with transfer institutions. Counselor training and student education are ongoing due to the continual flux and demands of the transfer institutions. |

**District Objective 2.1: Increase the number of students who are transfer-prepared annually.**
Transfer Outcomes

+21.7%

Transfer Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer-Prepared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+19%

+4.2%

+17%
Part 3: End of Cycle Assessment Results Summary

In Part 3 of this End of Cycle Report the District presents an analysis of progress over the 2015-2018 planning cycle for the purpose of informing everyone in the District of the progress made in the 2015-2018 planning cycle.

**District Goal #1.** College of the Sequoias will increase student enrollment relative to population growth and educational and workforce development needs.

**District Objective #1.1**
Increase overall enrollment by 1.75% annually.

From 2013-14 to 2016-17, the annual headcount has increased by 1,785 students (12.7%). The count of full-time equivalent students (FTES) also increased by 735 students (8.2%) for the same period.

The cumulative actions implemented and institutionalized over the past three years have helped the District exceed the annual enrollment growth target of 1.75%.

**District Goal #2.** College of the Sequoias will improve the rate at which its students complete degrees, certificates, and transfer objectives.
Thank You!
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