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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:

Double check the list and numbers and get the total (Are these correct?)

* To summarize themes and issues among the 74 (70 completed) instructional programs, 11 (9 completed) administrative units, 10 (8 completed) student affair units, and 14 (12 completed) academic affair units across the College, and 8 (8) of “Other” reviews: Inmate Education, Delano & Rural Initiatives, EMLS, Library, Adult, International Students, Veterans, and Baccalaureate.
* Of the completed reviews, 89 were Annual Updates and 21 were Comprehensive Reviews.
* To assess the Program Review Annual Update and Comprehensive Program Review processes and the validity of their 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 the ISIT, Facilities, Assessment, Curriculum, and Professional Development committees; FCDC; College Council; CTE; and the College President in the resource allocation process.

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

While individual program reviews 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 2016 reporting year, the Program Review Committee identified the following emergent themes. Themes and issues do not necessarily reflect shared experiences among all programs, but certainly emerged as common among multiple units.

* While PRC provided a packet to each program area that had all documents. Often, the incorrect form was filled out.
* Many of the Facilities Requests could have been submitted as work orders.
* Fewer number of M & O requests
* Technology requests remained steady
* Equity Question still left unanswered or answers did not reflect the question.
* Budget form not submitted in a few cases. Some were unsure of the process for submitting budget forms.
* Increase in overall Program Review submissions. This is due in part to the inclusion of more programs in the process.
* List of programs is still not conclusive. While we pulled the most recent information we could get, we need to investigate programs we did not hear from to determine if these programs need to be part of our work load. We will contact the appropriate academic administrator, CIO, to verify our list.
* Need a form to request management positions
* There was confusion with Assessment tabs for AU and Comp. As well, many programs did not include course assessments in document.

**Changes to Annual Program Review Process:** We are still navigating the master list of programs. We had a new degree not turn in their program review. Ag business for transfer, apprenticeship AA, auto brakes and wheel alignment (mixed in with AS degree) industrial drawing are going away. Confusion as to what some areas call themselves. Chief Fire Officer Certification (formerly chief officer), Fire Officer Certification is going away. Nursing has the AS degree and Vocational Nursing only.

The number of instructional programs we have and the number of program reviews turned in still continues to show a discrepancy. We started with a master list of 117 entities that needed to complete a program review dated August 2016. We received 110 (Kristin, are these numbers correct?). Following the Title 5 definition (see page 6), we should have received a review of every degree and certificate we offer. If the certificates were stackable, i.e., potentially leading to a degree if the student chose to continue, they were combined with that degree in the Annual Update (is this still true?).

**Observations based on the process:**

* For some departments, they had difficulty understanding the need to do a program review for all AA, AS, AST, and certificates.
* Technology and facilities assessment questions should be on the form as a separate tab.

As a result of the Program Review process, we are affecting change.

* Facilities has determined they need to create within the maintenance budget a furniture replacement plan, and a strategy to replace items blinds, clocks, etc. as needed.
* The Program Review Committee has become a strong repository of evidence that can be accessed for accreditation purposes.
* Campus culture is shifting.
  + Many of the faculty and staff are changing their perspectives on program review, regarding the process as an opportunity to promote educational excellence and improve instruction and services to students.
  + There is a better understanding among faculty and staff the implications of the program review process and its important role in accreditation. This has been vocalized within committee meetings across campus.

True in fall 2015; true in fall 2016:

* The instructional programs (degrees and certificates) we offered continue to evolve. While the Master List of Programs we used this cycle was a better snapshot in time, we still have current degrees and certificates that require further evaluation as to their validity.
* Working on how to best determine who needs to complete AU or Comp in instructional programs
* While we sent out packets with accurate forms with specific naming conventions, PRC continued receiving outdated forms.
* Documents had specific naming convention, and we only accepted those forms we sent out. Areas that submitted old form were given opportunity to submit appropriate form.
* AUs submitted without any forms
* Faculty and Classified requests were made using an old form. Need to change formatting of form.
* Some program do not use the program name as listed on the document provided by the VP of instruction
* Equity question was not answered or effectively addressed.
* Budget form was not submitted, or confusion as to who submits or how it is submitted.

**Concerns:**

The Program Review Committee considers the following concerns as training opportunities for the next cycle.

1. Some programs had spoken to resource and staffing needs within the AU or Comprehensive without submitting appropriate forms or submitted forms without justification.
2. A small number of programs submitted resources and staffing request forms from prior years as far back as 2013. When given the opportunity to resubmit proper forms, not all participants resubmitted forms.
3. Conclusions could be better drafted.
4. Create better prompts or examples within handbook to help with all resource requests
5. In the case of incorrect forms being filled out, meet with department chairs and deans, start the process in March. Provide an informal training at that time, with timelines in place.
6. Many of the Facilities Requests could have been submitted as work orders. PRC will provide examples of request types within handbook.
7. Some areas requested faculty, staff, and an increase in budget in order to be able to fulfill the college mission, implying that they could not do the job if the requests were not granted. (Still true?)
8. Overall, the responses varied in their consistencies. Some were very strong, with many model examples this year. Others were not as robust, and some conclusions could have been fleshed out.

**Recommendations for Future Practice:**

1. Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations.
2. Continue toward the accuracy of master list of programs.
3. Develop Annual Update and Comprehensive forms that are more relevant to the following five areas: Instructional, Administration, Student Affairs, Auxiliary Services, Management
4. Develop a 3-year comprehensive cycle for Student Affairs and administrative units.
5. Buy in, outreach, training, constituencies
6. Defend the process.
7. Maintain compliance with ACCJC standards
8. Always looking to improve efficiency of the process.
9. Successful institution, students success, we need to reflect on what we do to continuously improve our process.
10. Committee will address the need to meet with deans of admin units and other programs to help in classifying special programs and programs that do not lead to degrees.
11. Train current and incoming FCDC members in the spring using faculty who submitted model program reviews as the trainers.
12. Develop a written policy for out-of-cycle position requests.
13. Continue to post examples of effective program review elements.
14. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were an abstract.
15. Supporting the need for a college researcher. Hiring of this position is in process.
16. Require initiatives like Making It Happen (MIH); Central California Community Colleges Committed to Change (C6 grant); Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM); and Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) to participate in the program review process.
17. Require areas like Writing Center and Supplemental Instruction to participate in the program review process
18. Strive to ensure that direct correlation between the Budget Request Form and the Budget Request Process exists.
19. Hold a college-wide dialog about scheduling facilities for meetings, workshops, and events.
20. Develop a policy on consequences for programs that do not complete the Program Review Process.
21. Provide a document packet for each area which includes the most recent version of forms. Pre-populate the forms using the naming convention.
22. Provide a report to the President and VP regarding areas that did not submit a program review.
23. For AU/CR that are missing forms: send one email to Nan to send to FCDC, SS, and Admin SVC. The email will acknowledge receipt of the program review and request the missing forms (specifically best practices, faculty position request, classified position request, technology, and facilities).
24. Next year before program review is due, verify program title for each department. Include verification of programs that are not offered.
25. Update handbook to speak to equity question and budget form.
26. Continue to provide training for administrators, department chairs, and interested employees that are specific to those areas. Offer drop-in workshops at a variety of times.
27. Need a survey to provided data for the closing the loop document.
28. Create customizable form. To do this the committee will:

**Title 5 definition of an “educational program”:**

(m) “Educational program” is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.

*Source: 5 CCR section 55000*

*Barclays Official California Code of Regulations*

*Title 5. Education*

*Division 6. California Community Colleges*

*Chapter 6. Curriculum and Instruction*

*Subchapter 1. Programs, Courses and Classes*

*Article 1. Program, Course and Class Classification and Standards*

**This report and the following information is/will be available online at the Program Review Committee page:**

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

1. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Results Summary
2. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses
3. List of Model Annual Updates and Comprehensive Reviews
4. Annual Updates
5. Comprehensive Program Reviews
6. Best Practices
7. Faculty Position Requests
8. Classified Position Requests
9. ISIT Requests
10. M & O Requests