Institutional planning processes shall be broad-based, comprehensive, systematic, and integrated into all aspects of decision making within the district with the fundamental purpose of fulfilling the mission, vision, and core values of MiraCosta College. Data-driven comprehensive master planning for the district and annual program-review processes for all programs and services shall provide the basis for institutional planning.

The initial recommendation for integrating institutional planning rests with the Budget and Planning Committee, the Business and Administrative Services Division, and the Office of Institutional Research, as noted in the individual board policies and administrative procedures cited below.

Institutional planning processes shall be submitted to the California Community College (CCC) System Office when required.

Processes for developing, reviewing, updating, approving, and implementing plans and processes include:

A. Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP)
   1. Reviewed annually and updated every five years by the Budget and Planning Committee. The updated CMP will be approved by all governance councils as a recommendation to the superintendent/president.
   2. Implemented continuously via the annual program review process and the annual budget development process, as well as planning and budgeting within each division of the college.

B. Program Review Process
   1. Reviewed and updated annually by the Budget and Planning Committee, Institutional Program Review Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee as a recommendation to the Academic Senate Council; approved by the Academic Senate Council as a recommendation to the superintendent/president.
   2. Implemented annually by all programs and services.
C. Program Review/Budget Development Linkage Process (attached)

1. Reviewed annually and updated as needed by the Budget and Planning Committee and the Institutional Program Review Committee as a recommendation to the Academic Senate Council; approved by the Academic Senate Council as a recommendation to the superintendent/president.

2. Implemented annually by all programs and services and supervised by the Budget and Planning Committee.

D. Budget and Planning Calendar

1. Established and approved annually by the Budget and Planning Committee.

E. Sequential Resource Allocation Funding Process (see below)

1. Reviewed and implemented annually and updated and approved as needed by the VPBAS in consultation with the Budget and Planning Committee.

F. Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3420)

G. Student Equity Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 5300)

H. Matriculation Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 5050)

I. Transfer Center Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 5120)

J. Experiential Education Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4103)

K. EOPS Plan (see Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 5150)
Program Review to Budget Development Linkage Process

Program development plans are prioritized and approved by district constituencies in a collegial process, based on the district’s mission, vision, and core values, especially as embodied by the district’s Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP).

Process Overview

A. The program review to budget-development linkage identifies the funding requests to be granted by reviewing and prioritizing the program-development plans to which the funding requests are attached. The Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) recommends to the Vice President, Business and Administrative Services (VPBAS), which funding requests should be granted, based on the rankings of program development plans by the divisional review and plan review groups.

B. Program-development plans and their associated funding requests are developed by program personnel, in consultation with deans/managers and recorded in PERCY.

C. All program development plans are reviewed and prioritized in this process:

1. Divisional review stage—all program-development plans (with or without associated funding requests) are reviewed and prioritized by their respective divisions: Instructional Services Division, Student Services Division, Business and Administrative Services Division, the Office of the President.

2. Technical review stage—all program-development plans with associated funding requests are reviewed by the Technical Review Subcommittee of BPC to determine the true costs of funding requests, including benefits, total cost of ownership, etc.

3. Plan review stage—program-development plans with funding requests are divided into two categories for review by the plan review groups: Instructional Plan Review Group and Support Service Plan Review Group. The divisional review group rankings will be given appropriate weight by the plan review groups as they develop their prioritized lists of program-development plans.

4. Governance Council review stage—the prioritized lists from the plan review groups go to the governance councils for review and approval: Academic Senate Council, Classified Senate Council, and Administrative Council.

5. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) stage—the prioritized lists of program-development plans and their associated funding requests are reviewed by BPC, which creates one ranked list of all program-development plans with associated funding requests. BPC then makes recommendations to the VPBAS concerning which funding requests should be granted (except for requests for faculty growth positions—see #4 below).
6. Final funding stage—the VPBAS carries the funding-request recommendations to the superintendent/president, who makes the final determination of which requests will be funded. The VPBAS incorporates the approved funding requests into the district’s proposed operating budget.

D. Funding requests for full-time, faculty-growth positions are reviewed and prioritized, based on the program-development plans to which they are attached, by a process that ensures the Academic Senate maintains primary responsibility:

1. Technical review stage—as described in #3 above.

2. Plan review stage—the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) is the plan review group.

3. Academic Senate Council (ASC) stage—the faculty-growth position request rankings are reviewed and approved by the ASC.

4. Final stage—the president of the Academic Senate will consult with the superintendent/president who will determine the final list of faculty-growth position requests to be funded.

*Note: the divisional review stage and the Budget and Planning Committee stage are not included in this process.*

**Description of Stages**

**A. Divisional Review Stage**

1. The purpose of the divisional review stage is to provide for senior division administrators, in consultation with other employee groups represented in their divisions, to:

   a. Identify and prioritize those program-development plans that are most in keeping with the needs of the division.

   b. Identify plans that include funding requests that will be financed using funds other than the program-development funds.

   c. Identify plans that may be integrated.

   d. Identify plans that require additional funding requests and initiate those funding requests, including ensuring the highest priority plans go to the technical review stage.

2. The divisional review stage will include appropriate representation from the employee groups within the division:

   a. The chair of the divisional review group should be the senior administrator in the division, wherever possible.
b. Members of the divisional review groups will be appointed by the chairs of the divisional review groups, in consultation with the appropriate council leaders.

3. All program development plans will go through the divisional review stage:
   a. Program-development plans that do not have associated funding requests, and are not deemed by the divisional review group to need funding requests, will not continue any further in the budget-development process.
   b. All program-development plans that have associated funding requests, or are deemed by the divisional review group to need funding requests, will proceed through the technical review, plan review, and BPC stages of the budget-development process, and no funding requests will be removed from these plans.

B. Technical Review Stage

1. The purpose of the technical review stage is to more accurately identify the complete cost of the highest-priority funding requests, including such things as:
   a. Employee benefits for growth positions.
   b. Total cost of ownership (TCO) for equipment, etc.
   c. Additional items associated with funding requests that were not included in the submitted program-development plans, such as new computers for requested faculty-growth positions, etc.

2. The technical review stage will occur between the end of the divisional review stage and the beginning of the plan review stage.

3. The technical review group is a subcommittee of the Budget and Planning Committee.
   a. It is chaired by the VPBAS or designee.
   b. It will include representatives of all employee groups, particularly those who have strong experience in the areas of budget, finance, TCO, etc.

C. Plan Review Stage

1. The purpose of the plan review stage is to review and rank program-development plans.

2. In the plan review stage, program-development plans will be divided into two categories and will be ranked by two separate plan review groups—the Instructional Plan Review Group and the Support Services Plan Review Group.
a. Plans that primarily involve the instructional mission of the college, including but not limited to the following examples, are Instructional Plans:

(1) Curriculum
(2) Expansion of existing instructional programs
(3) Addition of new instructional programs
(4) Creation and implementation of instructional projects

b. Plans that primarily involve services that support the instructional mission of the college, including but not limited to these examples, are Support Services Plans:

(1) Expansion of existing support services programs
(2) Addition of new support services programs
(3) Creation and implementation of support services projects

3. The plan review groups will consist of a combination of members of college governance committees, divisional review groups, and department chairs appointed by BPC.

a. The Instructional Plan Review Group will consist of members from the Academic Affairs Committee, Courses and Programs Committee, department chairs, and the Instructional Services Division Review Group.

b. The Support Services Plan Review Group will consist of members from Student Affairs, the Campus and Community Relations Committees, and from Student Services, Business and Administrative Services, Instructional Services, and the President’s Office Divisional Review Groups.

c. The plan review groups may include additional resource persons, as the groups deem appropriate.

The chair of each plan review group will be chosen by its members.

D. Governance Council Review Stage

Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Administrative Councils review and approve the prioritized lists of program-development plans from both plan review groups.
E. Budget and Planning Committee Stage

The Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) creates one prioritized list of program- development plans from the two lists developed by the plan review groups and approved by the governance councils.

1. BPC develops a prioritized list of requests to be funded as a recommendation to the VPBAS based on available funds.

2. Faculty-growth-position requests to be funded will be identified in a separate process, described elsewhere in this document

F. Final Funding Stage

The VPBAS carries the funding-request recommendations to the superintendent/president, who will make the final determination of which requests will be funded. The VPBAS incorporates the funded requests into the district’s proposed operating budget. BPC votes to recommend the budget to the Administrative Council for approval and then to the superintendent/president, before it goes to the Board of Trustees for adoption.
## Sequential Resource Allocation Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Total Funds Available for Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Board Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent employee compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities, contracts, debt, insurance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less*</td>
<td>Internally Designated Ongoing Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment replacement, technology replacement, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(note: Indirect Cost accounts divisionally institutionalized in 09/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less*</td>
<td>Prior year level of operating budgets reflecting inter-divisional Program Review reallocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals</td>
<td>Net Funds Available for Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less*</td>
<td><strong>Program Review A</strong> - Full-time faculty standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth full-time faculty from Program Review as approved by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less*</td>
<td><strong>Program Review B</strong> - Academic schedule based on Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs associated with the Board-approved percent increase of the instructional schedule based on Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals</td>
<td>Discretionary Funds Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Increase other operating accounts by CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td><strong>Program Review C</strong> - Nonfaculty program review standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Increase to Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equals</td>
<td>Nothing Remaining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If a negative amount must start over from the top