

**AGENDA #1: PLANNING
Contents**

Developing a Comprehensive Planning Process 69

Strategic and Master Planning Process 74

 Institutional Effectiveness 74

 Program Effectiveness..... 76

 Annual Program Plans..... 78

 Educational and Facilities Master Plans..... 79

Communication about Planning..... 80

Evaluating the Strategic and Master Planning Process 80

Summary..... 81

AGENDA #1: PLANNING

To develop and implement a strategic and master planning process that serves the college by:

- *reviewing each college program annually,*
- *incorporating this program review into a process that leads departments to identify program strengths and weaknesses,*
- *including data for assessment of both institutional effectiveness and program improvement,*
- *linking this program review and consequent plans to resource allocations,*
- *providing the foundation for a three-year cycle of updating the college's educational and facilities master plans.*

Spurred by the accreditation standards and other markers of institutional excellence, for the past six years the college has progressively implemented a comprehensive planning process that was developed and refined through broad campus dialogue.

Developing a Comprehensive Planning Process

From 1992 to 2000, college plans were developed biannually; initial plans and collegial dialogue occurred in off-campus retreats every other year (P.1). Various strategies were used in these retreats to spark conversations about how to improve programs and services for students (P.2). A draft of the plan was then circulated collegewide, and the final edited document, called *A Vision of Our Future*, was widely distributed. The plan included planning assumptions, 12 primary institutional goals that reflected the college vision and mission, and specific objectives intended to move the college toward those goals. The following 12 goals of the college were consistent during this period of planning:

- provide quality education and access for students,
- provide a comprehensive program of student support services,
- enhance collegiality and a sense of community on campus,
- provide opportunities for members of the college community to engage in participatory governance,
- promote diversity across the college,
- promote the recruitment and development of high-quality staff,
- increase knowledge and use of educational technology,
- improve internal and external communication,
- develop and maintain partnerships within the district and with business, education, and government entities,
- augment financial resources,
- maintain and improve the college's physical environment,
- assess the effectiveness of the college in fulfilling its mission.

Responsibility for completing the objectives was assigned to specific administrative offices, and the first task of the following retreat was to assess progress on the goals and objectives from the prior plan.

Although effective as a dialogue tool, this planning process was not comprehensive in that it was not data-driven, did not link the plans to resource allocations, and did not provide strategies for program improvement. Following the accreditation site visit in 1997, the college leadership acknowledged that a more systematic process for effective strategic planning must be created. From 1997 through the present, Moorpark College has studied planning models, experimented, and finally developed a formal planning process that fulfills the criteria stated in the agenda above. This process began with incremental steps in fall 1998 and culminated in the college's approval of a comprehensive strategic and master planning process in spring 2003. The college is now activating this comprehensive strategic and master planning process.

After the first annual program plans were prepared in fall 1999, the Planning Task Force met each afternoon for one week to hear oral presentations of the college's programs and the key issues highlighted by this new approach to planning. During the week's dialogue, issues of collegewide importance surfaced; these issues were recorded and then framed as the nine strategic questions the college must address in developing the educational and facilities master plans. In February 2000, faculty and staff focused on developing answers to these questions at a weekend college retreat. For each strategic question, specific considerations were identified, as well as key reference documents, as the college community ventured into generated plans based on available data. The nine strategic questions are:

1. On-campus growth: How many students can our campus accommodate? How many students on a campus are too many students to maintain quality programs and services? How can we maintain collegiality and communication as we grow?
2. Off-campus growth: Given our growth, should we continue outreach programs? How can we provide off-campus programs and support for faculty that mirror the quality of on-campus services? Is there value in creating an off-campus, independent facility that would be owned and operated by the college? If so, how could this satellite location support rather than detract from the college's programs?
3. Growth of services and faculty/staff: As we continue to grow on campus and at off-campus sites, what is our goal of the level of service in terms of services for full-time faculty, services for part-time faculty, services for students, the faculty-to-student ratio, the classified-staff-to-student ratio, and the dean-to-student, dean-to-faculty, and dean-to-program ratios?

Agenda #1: Planning

4. Technology—Equipment: Given the rapid growth in the number of computers on campus in the past three years, what is needed now? How high is technology support in the campus priorities? What about smart classroom technology? What is the best way to handle replacement of current technology?

5. Technology—Staff support and organization of that support: Given that we have substantially increased hardware, infrastructure, and campus personnel to support technology in the past three years, how should we organize the personnel who support technology? Who should be the supervisor? How can we best continue to provide training and support for both administrative and instructional uses of technology?

6. Comprehensiveness of Programs: How broad can and should we become? What is our college's current balance between career-entry and transfer programs and courses? Given our budget limitations, we cannot be all things to all people. How can we continue to invite faculty to bring new programs to the college, yet maintain quality of existing programs? How broadly can we schedule classes and still provide appropriate support services? What is the role of distance education in our college plan?

7. Comprehensiveness of Scheduling and Marketing: Are we serving the students in our community in terms of scheduling classes? How can we improve scheduling? In what ways are we limiting student access to education based on our current pattern of scheduling classes? What are the basic services that we provide during alternate scheduling patterns? How can we improve marketing? In what ways do we limit student access in our current marketing?

8. Student outcomes: How can we improve in connecting students to support services that are most likely to increase student success in the classroom? How can we integrate and improve communication among the various types of instructional support services? How can we improve student retention within a semester? How can we improve student persistence?

9. College and District: What is Moorpark College's role as one college in a three-college district? In what ways can we demonstrate a districtwide commitment while remaining an advocate in support of our college's needs, especially in terms of budgeting and planning? What processes should be used to make decisions regarding the distribution of resources and programs among the three colleges and the district office?

The answers to these questions generated the plan collected in *A Vision of Our Future 2000* (P.1).

While the planning process used from 1992 through 2000 was a good first step, several factors recently converged to make the development of a comprehensive, data-driven planning process possible:

- Awareness that the current planning process needed to be improved. The 1997 accreditation recommendations that the college link planning to resource allocation was a clear trigger to examine the college planning process. Although the planning model embodied in *A Vision of Our Future* guided the college in setting operational goals, it failed to meet accreditation standards in three key ways: first, the college goals were generated by the perceptions of those attending the retreat instead of being based on an assessment of student needs or feedback on institutional goals; second, the operational plans were only indirectly connected to resource allocation; third, the planning process did not provide a schema to use student learning outcomes to improve programs.
- A districtwide focus on planning. A second consequence of the 1997 accreditation recommendations was an initiative called Futures Forum. This team approach to training on strategic and master planning was undertaken in response to the accreditation recommendation that the district and its three colleges collaborate to design and implement a comprehensive districtwide planning process. A team of about 50 people representing all four locations in the district began meeting collaboratively in March 1999 to develop a learning/organizational model for strategic planning. The Accreditation Midterm Report contains a detailed review of this process and the benefits to the college (P.3).
- Availability of data. Beginning in 1998, a new integrated software system, Banner, allowed the college to develop reports, such as the Program Planning Data Report described below, to provide program review information for instructional programs.
- Training. In keeping with the statewide focus on accountability, several local and state training opportunities (see timeline below) gave the college the tools it needed to develop comprehensive, data-driven planning processes firmly grounded in accountability, both institutionally and specific to a single program.

These influential factors and the steps taken by the college over the past six years to move from a more informal process of developing operational plans to the development of today's comprehensive strategic and master plan process are summarized in the following timeline:

Fall 1998	The Program Planning Data Report is developed, reviewed, and refined to provide comprehensive program review data for instructional programs.
-----------	---

Agenda #1: Planning

	<p>The Planning Task Force, an ad hoc committee formed for the purpose of developing the education and facilities master plans, develops the process for annual program plans to serve as the foundation for the educational master plan.</p> <p>The campus reviews the planning assumptions and process, edits and approves the final process and the definition of the list of programs.</p>
Spring 1999 - ongoing	<p>The Program Planning Data Report is incorporated into the resource allocation processes, such as the prioritization of faculty and staff positions.</p>
Fall 1999	<p>The first annual program plans are prepared by each college program and reviewed by the Planning Task Force.</p>
Fall 2001	<p>The second program plans are prepared. These are consolidated with the 1999 program plans plus data on anticipated collegewide growth to project growth for each college program at two future points: 2008 and 2015. These data and analyses of program strengths and weaknesses are the foundation to prepare the draft of an educational master plan, which is then used by the master architects to prepare the facilities master plan.</p>
Fall 2001 - Spring 2002	<p>The campus reviews and edits the educational and facilities master plans.</p>
March 2002	<p>Educational and facilities master plans (<i>Master Plan 2002</i>) are presented to the board of trustees.</p>
August 2002	<p>The Planning Task Force re-forms into the Committee on Accreditation and Planning (CAP). The charge of this committee is to establish both accreditation and planning as ongoing processes within the college governance structure.</p>
Fall 2002	<p>A nine-member team from CAP attends the California Assessment Institute for training to further develop the college's strategic planning process.</p>
Spring 2003	<p>Training on student learning outcomes is presented on campus by two facilitators, Dr. James and Karen Nichols. Their five-column model is adopted as the campus standard for assessing student learning outcomes designed to provide feedback for program improvement.</p>

The college mission is reviewed and edited based on insights learned in the training.

- Fall 2003 *Institutional Effectiveness at Moorpark College 2003-04* is distributed. CAP reviews, refines, and approves the college strategic and master planning process.
- Spring 2004 The college's strategic and master planning process is distributed and reviewed collegewide. Feedback is incorporated into the model, which is then approved by CAP.
By the end of the semester, all programs have identified at least two student learning outcomes, completing columns one through three of the five-column model. A timeline for the remaining steps in the program improvement process is developed, with a deadline for beginning the continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement.
- Fall 2004 *Institutional Effectiveness at Moorpark College 2004-05* is distributed.
The facilities master plan update is reviewed and finalized; the educational master plan is reviewed.
Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05 is distributed.
The program plan cycle for 2004-05 begins.

Strategic and Master Planning Process

With the separate pieces in place, as described in the timeline above, the comprehensive strategic and master planning process was developed and approved collegewide in spring 2004. This approval is the culmination of many small steps and seven years of work by the college community. That work included faculty and managers attending workshops and conferences, discussing the issues on campus, resolving resistance to this shift toward using data to make decisions, and creating a planning model comprehensive enough to meet all elements stated in this agenda and flexible enough to fit the college culture.

The strategic planning process includes multiple interrelated components, beginning with the college mission and culminating in educational and facilities master plans (P.4).

Institutional Effectiveness

The first set of data foundational to the strategic and master planning process is the assessment of institutional effectiveness. These measures summarize quantitative and qualitative indices of student access, student achievement, program review, and student and employee perceptions.

Agenda #1: Planning

The first three of these assessment categories are updated annually in the institutional effectiveness report. Perception surveys are administered to students and employees every three to four years by the District Office of Institutional Research to provide feedback on the college community's perceptions of services, facilities, and campus climate.

The first edition of *Institutional Effectiveness at Moorpark College*, for 2003-04, was distributed in fall 2003 (P.5). In spring 2004, interested members of the campus community critiqued this document and suggested improvements. The second edition of this annual summary of institutional effectiveness will be distributed in fall 2004 (P.6).

Common institutional effectiveness measures answer the questions:

- Are students drawn to the college? (enrollment)
- Do they complete the semester once they begin? (retention)
- Do they return to the college the following semester? (persistence)
- Do students complete courses successfully, with grades A, B, C, and credit? (course completion).

Based on data in *Institutional Effectiveness 2003-04*, Moorpark College has enjoyed a reasonable, consistent rate of enrollment growth over the past decade, growing an average of 5 percent per year. Retention measures how many students in classes at the fourth week of the semester continue through the semester to receive a final grade; although retention rates vary across programs, approximately 80 percent of Moorpark College students complete the semester. Persistence measures how many first-time students attending fall semester return for the following spring semester; from 1999 to 2002, the persistence rate of Moorpark College students was consistent at approximately 68 percent. In terms of successful course completion, Moorpark College students achieved an overall success rate for all courses of 67.2 percent, a close match with the state overall success rate of 67 percent as reported on the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Web page (www.cccco.edu). Charts depicting data on student demographics and student achievement are presented in the Background Materials section of this self-study.

The debut issue *Institutional Effectiveness 2003-04* has already increased Moorpark College's responsiveness to community needs. One implication for planning in the "Student Access" section of the report is: "Since the proportion of Hispanic students at Moorpark College is lower than the proportion of Hispanic residents in two cities in the college's immediate service area, the college needs to design targeted recruitment for this segment of the community" (P.5, p.18). This documentation led to two initiatives in fall 2003 designed to recruit Hispanic students: a team of counseling faculty visited local high schools to generate interest in attending Moorpark College, and the college hosted 600 Hispanic high school students in October 2003 for a day of leadership activities co-sponsored by the League of Latin American Citizens (see Agenda #2: Student Learning Programs and Services).

While the college is proud of these first initiatives, the use of collegewide data to spark program development and improvement is not yet common. The practice of using data to identify program strengths and weaknesses began in 1999 with the first annual program plans. However, institutional effectiveness data were distributed collegewide for the first time in fall 2003, and the college strategic and master planning process was first approved in spring 2004. The college is moving ahead on the task of converting to data-driven mechanisms, but is certainly at the initial stages of this conversion. Additional education on the reasons why such tasks will benefit the college, and training of faculty and staff on the use of data, are needed before such routine use of data will become part the college lexicon and culture. For example, although the student access and student achievement sections of *Institutional Effectiveness 2003-04* conclude with “implications for planning,” there is not yet a process for the college to reach consensus on institutional effectiveness goals nor the follow-up step of an annual review of those goals.

Program Effectiveness

The second data set foundational to the strategic planning process is the assessment of program effectiveness. These measures determine whether students are learning specifically what departments intended to teach, and are designed to improve programs based on quantifiable feedback.

Program effectiveness is evaluated with the five-step model created by Dr. James and Karen Nichols, adopted in January 2003 (P.7). Following this model, each program (instructional or student service):

- aligns itself with the college mission, establishing a program-specific mission with related student outcomes. Student outcomes are defined as clear statements of what students will learn;
- identifies measurable objectives in terms of knowledge, skills, or attitudes necessary to achieve the learning outcomes;
- states the exact means of assessment, including the criteria for success;
- summarizes the data collected to determine whether the objectives were met;
- applies the results from the assessment to improve student learning in the next cycle of planning and assessment.

Occupational programs have employed such a model for program improvement for a number of years (see Agenda #2: Student Learning Programs and Services, Summary Table 1). The Nursing program compiled student learning outcomes for its recent accreditation self-study (P.8); for example, one student learning outcome was: “Ninety percent of students in the Associate degree in nursing program will pass the National Council Licensing Exam (NCLEX) on the first attempt.” The yearly average for the last four years had been 94 percent, but in 2002 the pass rate dropped below 90 percent. In analyzing this result, the faculty reviewed all of the tests they were administering in their courses, as well

Agenda #1: Planning

as the national test they were administering after each course. Additionally, the nursing coordinator interviewed all of the graduates with low scores as to why they had not done well. From these data the faculty concluded that graduates were having trouble with critical thinking and analysis test items.

In order to improve the program and resulting student learning outcome, the faculty took the following actions:

- Rewrote all tests administered by the program to increase the number of critical thinking and analysis questions, from the earliest course, with largely recall, knowledge-based questions, to the most advanced course with 70 to 80 percent critical thinking and analysis items;
- Offered a workshop to all faculty on Test Item Writing and Analysis. One of the faculty who had served as a NCLEX writer contributed to the workshop;
- Changed from a paper national testing service to a computer-based testing service to prepare the students for the computer-based NCLEX.

As a result of these improvements, the pass rate increased to the 90th percentile.

The use of the Nichols model for program improvement in general education/transfer courses was initiated in 2003-04. Although there is now conceptual agreement with this approach and approval of its inclusion in the college strategic and master planning process, it has not yet been uniformly implemented across the college. A review of the annual program plans for 2003-04, the first time student learning outcomes were required, shows that some programs have begun the process by developing one or more outcomes, some programs are just beginning to gather feedback on their outcomes for program improvement, and a few programs continue to resist the process as an “additional task.” The status of each program’s work on student learning outcomes can be seen in the final section of each 2003-04 program plan (P.9); for easy reference to the collegewide status on developing student learning outcomes, these outcomes are also presented in a separate document (P.10).

One example of the work completed to date by a general education discipline is the assessment of the writing component of the college mission statement. In 2002-03 the English Department created the following student learning outcome for general education: “General Education program completers will write an organized essay that develops a controlling idea using Standard Written English.” They performed the assessment in Introduction to College Writing, a developmental class that satisfies the writing requirement for the Associate degree. They created a rubric (P.11) based on the department’s Standard Grading Criteria (P.12) and conducted departmental dialogue to agree upon the process and practice in applying the rubric. The rubric measured the four specific skills mentioned in the student learning outcome. Results of the first assessment, performed late in fall semester 2003, are:

Criterion	very good	satisfactory	not satisfactory
Controlling idea	175 (58.1%)	97 (32.2%)	29 (9.6%)
Organization	134 (44.5%)	125 (41.5%)	42 (14.0%)
Development	105 (35.0%)	137 (45.7%)	58 (19.3%)
Standard Written English	99 (33.0%)	156 (52.0%)	45 (15.0%)

These results have allowed individual instructors to refine their teaching focus and techniques in future classes. They have also been discussed in department faculty meetings and will guide curriculum revision, faculty mentoring, and future workshops on teaching.

Annual Program Plans

These two data components (institutional effectiveness and program improvement) are united in the annual program plans. Annual program plans were instituted in fall 1999 as a first strategy to link planning to resource allocation; this was a first transitional step away from the prior operational plans toward the current comprehensive strategic planning process. Following collegewide discussion in various groups, the two initial assumptions of this process that continue in today's processes are:

- “Program” refers to all college support services and instructional disciplines and programs. Support services include services to students (e.g., Admissions and Records, Business Office), services to faculty (e.g., copy center), and facilities (e.g., maintenance and grounds).
- Each of the college's programs will participate in a review of its services, strengths, and needs in order to accurately assess the college and create strategic plans that link resources to areas that need support to maintain or improve excellence or that have potential to grow.

Institutional effectiveness and program effectiveness measurements are the quantifiable bases for the plans prepared by each college program (P.13). The template for the program plans has been refined each year as the strategic planning process was more clearly developed thanks to training the college community received on assessment strategies.

Currently, the five components of the annual program plans are (P.14):

- A description of the current program, including number of faculty and staff, and an analysis of access, breadth, and depth of the program;
- A review of the program's strengths and weaknesses based on program review data, institutional effectiveness measures, and other sources, such as advisory committees or labor market information;
- Plans to continue a program's strengths and address weaknesses;
- Requests and justification for faculty, staff, equipment, and space based on those plans;
- Summary of the program's work on assessing student learning outcomes and the resulting plans for program improvement.

Agenda #1: Planning

Academic programs use the college's Program Planning Data Report for program review information. This resource provides consistent information across disciplines, such as census enrollments, retention, faculty load information (full-time to part-time ratios), and program efficiency (P.15). This report is available to all departments on the college intranet and can be easily printed in each division office by managers and classified staff. Non-instructional campus programs, such as student and administrative services, must gather and report data on institutional effectiveness tailored to their unique role in the college. There is currently unevenness among non-instructional programs in the depth and integrity of data used for annual program plans; some programs are at the initial stages of developing program review measures, while other programs have well-developed tools (P.16).

Annual program plans are completed each fall; during late fall and spring, various campus groups use those plans to allocate resources (P.17). For example, the processes for prioritizing full-time faculty positions and classified positions (described in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05*) use the annual program plans as the foundational documents for developing the list of position priorities that are then recommended to the college president. Begun in 1999, the annual program plan process has been revised in content but has remained the primary tool for program review and requests for resources.

However, the annual program plan process will continue to be modified. The current version of the strategic and master planning process lacks a link between course outlines and student learning outcomes; in 2004-05, in addition to progressing with the development of student learning outcomes, the college plans to link course outlines with student learning outcomes. This missing connection and the plan to address the gap is described in Agenda #2: Student Learning Programs and Services.

Educational and Facilities Master Plans

The culmination of the strategic and master planning process is the development of comprehensive educational and facilities master plans. These documents provide a roadmap for the college, with strategies for meeting the needs of future students. Each program is analyzed for the ways the college's projected growth will affect students' needs for a particular program based on Ventura County population projections, current enrollment, and labor market information. This mix of quantitative and qualitative information is filtered through the college mission and vision to provide a logical structure for ordered growth.

The most recent educational and facilities master plan was produced as a combined *Master Plan 2002* (P.18). The educational master plan includes growth projections for the college service areas, followed by the status and projected growth of each college program. The facilities master plan then links these projections to justifications for capital construction and renovation needs.

The educational master plan will be updated every three years by incorporating information and enrollment projections from the previous three annual program plans, the previous institutional effectiveness reports, and the most recent county population statistics. The next update of this document will be distributed in fall 2004 for collegewide review and will be completed by January 2005.

The facilities master plan is being updated in summer 2004. The reason for this out-of-cycle update is the passage of the bond for capital construction in spring 2002 and the resulting intense period of facilities planning (details in Agenda #4: Resources).

Communication about Planning

Information about planning is communicated within the college community in a variety of ways:

- Campuswide emails (P.19),
- Posting of plans on the college intranet,
- Town Hall meetings (P.20),
- Reports in shared-governance groups such as the Academic Senate (P.21),
- Monthly meetings of the two shared-governance committees most directly related to planning, the Facilities Planning Steering Committee and the Committee on Accreditation and Planning (P.22, P.23).

Information about planning and accomplishments is also communicated to the community external to the college in a variety of ways:

- Frequent news releases distributed to the local press and posted on the college Web site to herald student achievements, such as transfer rates, graduation statistics, enrollment, and individual accomplishments (P.24),
- Reports to the board of trustees (P.25),
- Speeches to local service clubs (P.26),
- Tours for service clubs and politicians (P.27),
- Reports to the Citizens' Oversight Committee for Measure S (P.28).

Evaluating the Strategic and Master Planning Process

The Moorpark College strategic and master planning process was approved by the Committee on Accreditation and Planning in spring 2004, following feedback on the various components of the plan from other campus groups such as the Deans' Council, Academic Senate, and the Student Success Committee. Although the annual program plans have been used in resource allocation since 1998, the college is in the initial implementation phase of this comprehensive planning model in 2004-05.

Agenda #1: Planning

As noted earlier, while the assumptions that drive the process of annual program plans have remained unchanged since the initial planning-how-to-plan decisions in 1998, the details of the template have been revised every year. The college culture embraces this process of experimentation, review, and revision. In keeping with this approach, the components of the college's strategic and master planning process will be discussed annually and changes made as needed.

Since 1997 Moorpark College has implemented numerous decisions and processes intended to improve student learning. At the heart of this approach to continuous improvement in student learning, there is a blending of the value of creativity with the value of systematic planning and assessment. Permanent ongoing processes, like annual program plans and the standing Committee on Accreditation and Planning, require accountability of programs and services to the college mission while leaving the faculty, staff, and administration free to pursue the desired student outcomes in appropriate but unrestricted form.

Processes will continue to be revised as lessons are learned. These processes will continue to improve as the cycle comes full circle and the college evaluates the effectiveness of this planning model. Great strides have been made in planning and the use of data to make decisions since the last accreditation visit in 1997, yet the college is just beginning to implement a full cycle of its new strategic and master planning process.

Summary

Following a decade of processes that generated collegewide consensus on operational plans, a comprehensive strategic and master planning process was approved by Moorpark College in spring 2004. This process fulfills the original objectives of creating a process that

- reviews each college program annually;
- incorporates program review, leading departments to identify program strengths and weaknesses;
- includes data for assessment of both institutional effectiveness and program improvement;
- links program review and consequent plans to resource allocations;
- provides the foundation for a three-year cycle of updating the college's educational and facilities master plans.

The processes will be revised as the college evaluates the effectiveness of this planning model and extends the model to include new features, such as developing a process for setting institutional effectiveness goals and reviewing progress on those goals annually and assessing the effectiveness of this model to improve instructional programs, student support services, library, and other learning support services.

**Documents for
Agenda #1: Planning**

- P.1 *A Vision of Our Future*: plans for 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000
- P.2 Information from 1998 retreat
- P.3 Moorpark College Midterm Report, November 2000
- P.4 *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05*
- P.5 *Institutional Effectiveness 2003-04*
- P.6 *Institutional Effectiveness 2004-05*
- P.7 Nichols model
- P.8 National League of Nursing Self-Study 2003
- P.9 Annual Program Plans 1999-00, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04
- P.10 Student learning outcomes from annual program plans 2003-04
- P.11 Standards for Assessing English 02 Essays
- P.12 Moorpark College English Department Standard Grading Criteria
- P.13 List of college programs
- P.14 Annual Program Plan Template for 2003-04
- P.15 Current Program Planning Data Report and glossary
- P.16 Annual report for Student Health Center
- P.17 Charts on process for prioritizing faculty and staff
- P.18 *Master Plan 2002*
- P.19 Sample emails on facilities issues
- P.20 Town Hall meeting announcements (emails)
- P.21 Academic Senate minutes reflecting dialogue on facilities
- P.22 Fiscal Planning Steering Committee agendas
- P.23 Committee on Accreditation and Planning agendas
- P.24 Packet of press releases
- P.25 Board minutes highlighting Moorpark College reports and Moorpark College educational master plan report
- P.26 President's calendar with speeches to service clubs highlighted
- P.27 President's calendar with campus tours for service clubs and politicians highlighted
- P.28 Citizens' Oversight Committee agendas