**Summary of Program Review Annual Update**

**Process and Outcomes**

**Fall 2013**

**Prepared by the Program Review Committee**

**Purpose of Annual Report:**

The Program Review Committee prepares an annual report for the College President, Academic Senate President, and College Council. The purposes of this report are as follows:

* To summarize themes and issues among the 57 instructional programs and the 18 administrative or student service units (non-instructional) across the College.
* To assess the Program Review Annual Update process and the validity of its outcomes for the purpose of providing recommendations for future improvement as well as to share best practices.
* To provide information to help decision-making bodies such as ISIT, Facilities Planning Committee, FCDC, and the College President in the resource allocation process.

**Outcome of Program Review Annual Update Findings: Synthesis of Common Themes and Issues:**

While individual Annual Updates provide insightful information specific to that program, a synthesis of all programs seeks to identify common themes and issues that tend to appear among several programs, as well as to identify outliers who deviate from shared tendencies among other programs. For the 2013 reporting year, the Program Review Committee identified the following emergent themes. Please note that these themes do not necessarily reflect shared experiences among all programs, but certainly emerged as common themes among multiple units.

* 1. Aging infrastructure
  2. Student demographics (increase in enrollment; increase in Hispanic students served; decrease in enrollment among African American students)
  3. Lack of understanding of how to use and incorporate data into the Annual Update. Also, are programs getting the data they need?
  4. Technology disparity in facilities
  5. Classroom utilization issues
  6. Increase in number of faculty and classified position requests

**Changes to Annual Program Review Process:**

Based on the 2012 APR evaluation recommendations and the ACCJC recommendations, the Program Review Committee made the following changes to the Program Review process:

1. Changed to the Title 5 definition of “program” (degree or certificate granting). As a result, the number of programs submitting Annual Updates increased:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2012** | **2013** |
| Instructional programs | 26 | 57 |
| Administrative or student services (non-instructional) | 15 | 18 |
|  |  |  |

1. For 2013 only, instructional programs required to complete Annual Update were limited to degree-granting programs, Academic Development, ESL, and the Library. Certificate of Achievement-granting programs were not yet required to participate. They will be included in Phase 2.
2. Changed to Annual Update format.
3. Offered early feedback opportunity before Annual Update was due. Ten instructional programs and two administrative units took advantage of the opportunity.
4. Added questions on how assessment outcomes research affected planning and resource requests.
5. Added questions on technology use and effectiveness.
6. Changed to Three-Year Comprehensive Program Review format.
7. Continued to refine list of programs.

**Annual Update Process: Synthesis of Common Concerns and Issues:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concerns**  **& Issues** | **2012** | **2013** | **Action Plan** |
| New Timeline | This is BC’s second year implementing our current APR format. However, a new timeline was administered to ensure that information could be submitted to decision-making committees in a timely manner. It is generally agreed that the PRC’s timeline and due dates were quite aggressive. Unfortunately, this timeline conflicted with other processes this fall (including accreditation), which resulted in increased anxiety among faculty chairs and programs. | The pacing was better, but the timeline was still tight because it occurred during the scheduling process.  The information did get to the decision-making committees in a timely manner (ISIT, Facilities, and FCDC). | Begin the Annual Update cycle in the spring. |
| APR Tracking | Not all APRs were submitted by their due date. In some cases, it was difficult to ascertain when and to whom the APR was submitted (program, dean, IRP?) | Again, not all Annual Updates were submitted on time. Delays were due primarily to changes in leadership. | Provide more training for new administrators and department chairs.  Compile a handbook. |
| Self-Evaluation | Data provided by IRP was helpful and standardized. However, the self-evaluation process is not completely objective when opportunity is given to provide subjective (narrative) data. | This year’s Program Reviews were more objective. | Provide training to units regarding the value and purpose of this process.  Consider using Multiple Measures: the utilization and incorporation of additional data (from IR or elsewhere). Also, getting the right type (relevant) data helps (i.e. Data Accuracy) |
| Integration | The APR process seems to occur in relative isolation from other campus process, lacking integration with critical functions of the institution, such as program sustainability, assessment, and curriculum. | The Annual Update process is better integrated in the resource allocation process. | Track the connection between the Annual Updates and resource allocations. |
| Lengthy APR Process | The APR process is very lengthy and time-consuming. Some participants do not believe in its value and utility upon completion. | The process is better defined and more streamlined. | Track the connection between the Annual Updates and resource allocations. |
| Data Accuracy | Some data provided by IRP were found to be inaccurate, which resulted in decreased trust and faith in the APR process by some faculty chairs and program directors. | The primary question: Is the data provided relevant to the program? | Use responses to evaluation question 3 as a starting point (What, if any, other data would you find helpful in preparing future Annual Updates?) |

**Recommendations for Future Practice:**

* Track the connection between the Annual Updates and resource allocations.
* Develop a master list of programs.
* Compile a handbook.
* Provide additional training.
* Provide more training for new administrators and department chairs.
* Pilot the Three-Year Comprehensive Program Review.
* Begin the Annual Update cycle in the spring.
* Advocate for college researcher.

**This report is available online at the Program Review Committee page:**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview>

The printed report includes the following appendices:

1. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Results Summary
2. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses
3. List of Model Annual Updates

Appendices available online only:

1. Best Practices
2. Faculty Position Requests
3. Classified Position Requests
4. ISIT Requests
5. M & O Requests
6. Responses to Technology Evaluation Questions ([2013 2014 Tech Assessment with ISIT Requests and Justifications.xlsx](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/2013%202014%20Tech%20Assessment%20with%20ISIT%20Requests%20and%20Justifications.xlsx))
7. Responses to Role of Assessment Outcomes Research on Program Planning and Resource Requests ([Assessment Question table.docx](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Assessment%20Question%20table.docx))

**APPENDIX 1**

**Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Results Summary**

A total of 25 responses were gathered from the program review annual update evaluation. The complete set of responses appears on the next page. Here is a brief summary, including trends in responses to each of the five questions.

**Benefits of annual update process**

* Simplified forms, easier to navigate, streamlined
* Good opportunity to evaluate, assess, take stock
* Early feedback was useful in improving annual update
* Reflection on data and student success

**Suggestions for future improvement**

* Link forms together
* Allow more time in process/start earlier
* Include instructions, a handbook, examples of how to fill out annual update
* Clearer connections as to how program review leads to decisions, resource allocation, and college planning

**Additional/different data that would be helpful**

* Number of declared majors (most cited)
* Better alignment of data provided and programs/courses (new program definition)
* Number of transfers

**How forms could be improved**

* Technology forms unclear (most cited)
* Technology assessment section
* Goals (transition to new program definition created a mismatch in addressing previous goals)
* Provide examples of how forms should be completed

**Additional comments**

* Do survey earlier, right after annual update is due

**APPENDIX 2**

**Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses**

**1. What did you find beneficial about the Annual Update Process?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** |
| 1 | Much better than the previous year. |
| 2 | More stream-lined process. The APR training sessions were very beneficial. |
| 3 | test |
| 4 | Knowing our numbers. |
| 5 | Thank you for keeping it limited to disciplines and not going with "programs" (i.e. each certificate and degree). Also, it was a good call to have faculty members interpret the data from IRP, rather than cut and paste like before. Curriculum review section (the grid with courses and review dates) was really helpful! Department Chairs can use that page to check on faculty progress. |
| 6 |  |
| 7 | The chance to really look at our entire program and evaluate for effectveness |
| 8 | It allow us to see what changes had been made in our program. |
| 9 | Reflecting on student success in my area and avenues to explore to improve student success. |
| 10 | Shorter and more assurances that the information we provide is going to be linked to a decision (I hope that is actually true!). |
| 11 | Brief. |
| 12 | It made me stop and consider how our department functions and what our mission is. |
| 13 | I liked getting early feedback from the APR committee before the final draft was due. |
| 14 | The simplification of the forms helped. It also helps with the linkages to the ISIT and M&O requests. The feedback from the Program Committee is a wonderful addition. It allows discussion to occur in the departments to self imporve and assess or reassess. |
| 15 | The process form was straight forward. Did have a problem trying to decide what was being asked in part II, questions a and b. |
| 16 | It focused our attention on the various educational goals and processes at the college. |
| 17 | The shorter form - easier to understand and fill out for anyone involved in the process. |
| 18 | Opportunity to evaluate the Program |
| 19 | Not much other than the fact that it requires departments to, if only briefly, look at where they are and where they want to be. |
| 20 | I thought this was a more straightforward and less complicated form to complete than in past years. |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | Streamlined, tied to other requests. |
| 23 | It lets you look at your program in a honest and objective way. |
| 24 | It was streamlined compared previous years. |
| 25 | Provides and opportunity to assess and evaluate programs. This form is better than the previous version |

**2. How can we improve the Annual Update Process in the future?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** |
| 1 |  |
| 2 | Better data. I will use ODS and Data Mart in the future. |
| 3 | test |
| 4 | Reduce the number of pages and make the answers simpler. Work toward information about a program not the individual degrees. |
| 5 | There seems to be a number of questions that are similar - it's as if things keep getting added to the form. Also, there is no feedback loop - never has been. When things are requested or shortcomings are reported, who responds? No administrative response. No feedback about anything that is in the form. With no response, this seems to be an exercise that satisfies accreditation but nothing more. |
| 6 | • • No place to discuss maintenance requests in the update form. Requests can be made, but there’s no place in the update to justify them or describe why the need exists. • One program provided a number of appendices to supplement their report. What do we do with these when the program reviews and/or updates are collected and posted? Just append them and include? • Will the data be appended to each program review when they’re posted wherever we’re going to post them? • In section III, the part to mention new technology needs seems to be available only for those who have not recently received new technology (“If no…”) • Should M&O, ISIT, position and budget requests be justified within the document or only within those forms? There seems to be some confusion on that because some programs mention needs within the document, but then fail to make requests. Others document needs well in their requests, but don’t discuss those needs in their AUs. |
| 7 | No improvements needed in my opinion |
| 8 | Make data related to students success, population, etc, accessible to us. |
| 9 | For the technology assessment part (III a), split III a into three subsets like so: III a. If your program received new or repurposed technology, how have you assessed the outcome of the use of that technology and its effectiveness as it relates to student outcomes? III b. If your program did not receive new/repurposed technology, what technology could play a contributing factor in future student success and outcomes for your program? How would you evaluate the use of this technology? [Note: if you have specific technology requests that can be tied to the college's strategic initiatives and you have an assessment plan for the technology, then fill out the ISIT Technology Request form.] III c. For either question (a) or (b) above, how might other areas use this technology? On the ISIT request spreadsheet form, we should add a field to hold the assessment plan for a given technology/hardware request---have it as a copy/paste from the revised III b part. |
| 10 | I'd like to see all of the forms linked together (ISIT, position requests, etc) in a single document. |
| 11 | Clearer instructions, less "we're in a transition..." |
| 12 | Since this was my first time working on the annual update, I don't have a frame of reference yet, so I don't have any suggestions. |
| 13 | Give us a little more time. |
| 14 | It would help if the process can be started sometime in May of the current academic year planning into the new academic year. The timing with everything else being due is a challence. |
| 15 | Let us try this format for a year or so and determine if it is revealing what is beneficial. |
| 16 | Having more time for review before turning in the final forms would be helpful. |
| 17 | Have more clear, concise instructions. Also, a handbook would be helpful with examples of how to fill out each section. |
| 18 | Need to have a system to capture equipment needs, much like IT and M&O needs.Need to have the ability to capture areas that may not fit the definition of Program, for example development of a new Allied Health Program didn't fit any existing opportunities. Data needs to be provided as early as possible, deadlines are quick which doesn't allow a lot of opportunity for analysis and evaluation |
| 19 | Provide us with EXAMPLES of EXACTLY what you want from us. This is not the time to be creative - it is a time to be efficient and to the point for all those concerned. For those departments that would like to "wax eloquent", have an optional section that allows for this, but do not make it mandatory. |
| 20 | I would like to know that there is a connection between the AUs and the decisions made on campus. Do more thoughtful AUs "produce" better results when it comes to hiring, budgets, etc. or can I just submit anything and get the same results? |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | Clarify who is to do an update. Have sign-off by the dean. Hold people accountable to use the data. |
| 23 | Don't do in the first part of the semester. |
| 24 | Keep it simple |
| 25 | provide an example create a handbook explaining each section and suggestions for items to include. |

**3. What, if any, other data would you find helpful in preparing future Annual Updates?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** |
| 1 |  |
| 2 | List of majors and # of majors. List of degrees within the major vs. other campus departments How many transfer to 4-yr schools? to CSUB? to all CSUs? to UCs? (Compared to other departments) How many |
| 3 | test |
| 4 | If program statistics are available to everyone, why do we need to repeat them on the annual update? Why don't the people that are interested in those numbers just look at them? |
| 5 | You need to include Architecture data on Engineering and Industrial Technology. Architecture data was erroneously assigned to some other department. |
| 6 |  |
| 7 | Well, it would be nice to have the number of all the first-time students by semester for our department. I would also like a breakdown of current students in terms of completion of matriculation: orientation, counseling, educational plan, follow up services. |
| 8 | The same mentioned above. |
| 9 | To know when curriculum in our area would be up for curriculum review. Should be able to get that data from the Curriculum Comm chair(s). |
| 10 | Numbers of declared majors. |
| 11 | ? |
| 12 | I think costs associated with certain M&O and IT requests might be helpful. |
| 13 | Since our department does not have a major, I would like to see more majors that they obtain degrees or certificates in - automotive, child development, art, etc. |
| 14 | It would help if some of the trend data was emailed on time. |
| 15 | The emphasis in the two year institution seems to be toward degrees. It would be great if we could simply trace those in the STEM area that have transferred without receiving a "degree". |
| 16 | None that come to mind. |
| 17 | None - we're not an instructional program - we don't have any demographical data other than service data. |
| 18 | Would like BLS data for reporting about CTE programs. Would also like declared majors |
| 19 | Why is it that the statistics the administration wants to see are not just PROVIDED to the departments? Why have everyone duplicate the effort trolling ODS and other sites looking for something the helps to justify their existence and explain away their perceived deficiencies? This process could be automated to save everyone (even the researchers) time. |
| 20 | none for my area |
| 21 | Most degrees include courses from other disciplines. The degree-granting program needs all the relevant course data, not just their own. |
| 22 | Needs to be clear data by discipline and with ATD goals the degrees awarded and success and retention rates need to be by subgroups. |
| 23 | N/a |
| 24 | For purpuses of room usage, we need each program to report on classroom space used. |
| 25 | None at the moment but i would be nice to have the ability to query for data when completing the AU. |

**4. Which, if any, parts of the Annual Update forms were unclear to you or could be improved?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** |
| 1 | Technology requests seem a little complicated. Not unusuable, but there must be an easier way. |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | test |
| 4 |  |
| 5 | 1. Best Practices form - form said there would be examples, but none were provided. 2. Program assessment question a. - did that refer to PLO or SLO assessments? 3. The goals section - this was a problem since the last Unit Plan was by department and now it is by discipline. Also, the section about how program assessments guided the resources requests - does ISIT, FCDC, Facilities, Budgeting, and the other entities that use the request documents actually take the time to read what was reported in this section of the update? If not, why have faculty spend the time to do this? |
| 6 | • A good number of best practices are things not easily replicable by other areas. Maybe we could provide better direction? • The header on the checklist form repeats into the first row (overall summary) when the checklist goes into the second page. • When programs list courses in their curricular review and when they are up for review, sometimes there are several courses in one year. This generates a question (in my mind at least) about whether they would be better off having them spread out more. However, it may well be that some courses find it appropriate and useful to review all of their courses at the same time, or at least related ones at the same time. This should be up to the program, but should we consider a question asking them to address the issue? |
| 7 | None |
| 8 | None. |
| 9 | With the move to degree/certificate level program review, there were no "Previously Established Goals" at the degree/certificate level program to draw from, so we just used our department level goals. PRC needs to rework that section. I have already suggested what needs to be changed in the technology assessment section above. |
| 10 | I don't remember. |
| 11 | ? |
| 12 | All pretty self-explanatory. |
| 13 | The boxes that were checked as to whether something had been completed as opposed to whether data was used. That initially made me think I needed to include data, or that something was wrong because "no" had been checked when in fact, I had completed it correctly. |
| 14 | The assessment of the technology piece was a little unclear. |
| 15 | As stated in box two above- Questions a and b might be better stated. |
| 16 | We had to revise some areas but I cannot recall the exact details. |
| 17 | The goals section needs work |
| 18 | None at this time |
| 19 | The technology request forms could be made to be a bit more clear. ALWAYS provide an example, or multiple examples, of the form filled out the way the COMMITTEE wants them to be filled out. |
| 20 | The assessment of technology; goals - I was unsure where to put new goals for the upcoming year |
| 21 | The goal section needs more instruction. |
| 22 | Some things fell outside of the list. Some just a few courses leading to a employment. Things like work experience, medical science or other specific courses need to be reviewed. An overall CTE program review might pick these up. |
| 23 | Still concern if they will be used in the planning process. |
| 24 |  |
| 25 | the goals section should ask to have the goal listed with progress on the goal. There should be a place for identification of new goal. Include intructions to attach the supporting IR data. |

**5. What other comments do you have for the Program Review Committee to consider?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Comment** |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | test |
| 4 | Change the time frame for the review. It happens at a time that is very inconvenient. Have it due during summer when things are slow. |
| 5 | My faculty members in my department still think this is "busy work." There is lots of data collected and things to respond to, but other than M&O, ISIT, and Position Requests, nothing else seems to have any bearing whatsoever anywhere. What does the College actually do with the information in the update form itself? Also, a rubric of how the updates and comprehensive program review form (when assigned) should be provided that answers these questions: What does the PRC look for? How are programs rated? |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 | I want the revised III b (future technology plans) to include even dreams of what they plan on investigating for technology uses in the future, so they don't have to have specific hardware requests for the coming year (prices, model #, number of hardware pieces, etc.) to fill out the revised III b. But having them fill out the assessment plan for even nebulous future technology planning, makes one realize that all requests must have an assessment plan ready to go. |
| 10 | Best to do the survey immediately after the reviews are due. I, for one, would be able to be more specific about concerns then. |
| 11 | ? |
| 12 |  |
| 13 | I still haven't seen the final comments/feedback. When is that coming? |
| 14 | Every year the program review process is improved. The linkages are clear and how they connect with budget and other requests become visual. |
| 15 | Special studies courses were essentially eliminated due to lack of update. Some students like to reach beyond what is available in the regular class. These courses were a means of providing that instruction. It appears to be near impossible to provide this type of course that allows repeat. Please consider this under curricular review questions b and c. |
| 16 | Have us take the survey soon after completing the Annual Update. |
| 17 | Even with all the assessment we do on our campus, there is still not an understanding of what we really need assessment to do for us. We need more training on assessing our programs... instructional, administrative or student programs. No one program/area should be exempt from working on an annual update. |
| 18 | Really need to address those programs that don't meet the definition of a Program, since they do provide job skill certificates, employment and more importantly the community college mission |
| 19 |  |
| 20 | None |
| 21 |  |
| 22 | Program review is not just a faculty responsibility, although it is central in 10 1. It is a joint responsibility and administrators have responsibility. How does that responsibility become part of the process in a transparent way? |
| 23 | N./a |
| 24 | Again, please keep it simple. |
| 25 | I liked the chart in the old form that walked through the identification of the SLO, the assessment benchmark, the data that supported the ssumptions,etc. |

**APPENDIX 3:**

**List of Model Annual Updates**

Communication

Construction Technology

Counseling

English

English for Multilingual Students

Fire Technology

Library

Registered Nursing

**Annual Updates available online at** <https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview>