TO: Members of the President's Cabinet
FROM: Program Review Steering Committee
DATE: March 17, 2015
SUBJECT: PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT 2014-2015

This memo introduces the Annual Report, prepared by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and submitted by the Program Review Steering Committee.

Within the report, each program or service area is arranged according to School or Division. Information provided includes:

- The name of the program / service area and lead writer(s)
- The name of the assigned liaison
- A summary of the program review areas completed by the lead writer
- A summary of the program or service area's goals, objectives, and resource requests

This report has a companion document, the *Program Review Summaries Report 2014-2015*, which contains the executive summary provided by each lead writer, describing the current status of the program.

<u>Process</u>

The 2014-2015 Program Review process is:

- a five-month writing period from September 12, 2014, to January 30, 2015
- a two-week final review period for liaisons and managers from January 30 to February 17, 2015
- aligned with budget development in the Spring, such that:
  - all supplies, equipment, and facilities requests were forwarded to the Budget Allocation Recommendation Committee in late February 2015
  - all personnel requests were forwarded appropriately to either the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee or the Classified Hiring Priorities Committee in February-March 2015
- a fully automated process
  - hosted through Taskstream, which is available 24/7 for work and review by authorized program/service area personnel to assure collaboration and provide adequate access for inputting information
- a four-year cycle
  - a comprehensive review in year one, followed by three years of updates; this year is the comprehensive year
- a system of checks and balances
  - program reviews are the responsibility of the entire program or service area, in that there is a lead writer, but the lead writer should collaborate with program or service area colleagues and dean or manager during the formative stages of the draft
  - a Program Review peer liaison (e.g., an instructional program is reviewed by an instructional liaison) is assigned to each lead writer to provide support in understanding the process and the expectations of the questions asked in the document

    - the Committee Co-Chairs provide a second level of support to lead writers
    - prioritizing committees for resource allocation provide direct support to lead writers via training sessions, support materials (including rubrics), and on-going interaction throughout the process
    - accuracy is assured via a reconciliation process initiated by the Program Review Administrative Co-Chair, using the following protocol:
        - submitted program reviews are reviewed and summarized into spreadsheets, where any resource requests are recorded
        - each Program Review is printed in its entirety, along with any attachments, and kept on file in in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness
        - spreadsheets are compared to the Program Review document to check for discrepancies, which are resolved
        - the BARC spreadsheet is sent to all lead writers to check for discrepancies, which are resolved
        - the finalized spreadsheets then inform resource allocation for Spring

<u>Description of 2014-2015 Cycle</u>

The comprehensive review update consists of the following components:

- four modules tailored for Instruction, Administrative Services, Student Services, and Counseling & DSPS
- executive summary of the program review
- name of lead writer(s) and list of program/service area's administrators, faculty, and staff
- mission statement and alignment with College mission statement
- SLO or AUO analysis, with implications for practice
- review of Instructional Key Performance Indicator data including student demographics, student retention and success, and productivity
- data section for program or service area-specific analysis
- discussion of program/area strengths, challenges, and external influences
- statement of program/area vision, goals to achieve that vision, and action plans to meet the goals; all goals are to be mapped to College strategic goals and/or ILOs
- follow up on outcomes of any resources allocated through the program review process in the past year specifically addressing the impact on student learning
- optional new faculty hiring request form
- optional new classified hiring request form
- optional resource request forms (BARC)

The timeline includes targeted dates for lead writers to submit their documents to their deans/ managers and liaisons for mid-point review. This was to provide structure to assure collaboration. Final documents were submitted six weeks later. They were reviewed by the liaison and reviewed and signed electronically by the dean or manager, using a form within Taskstream. This Annual Report is based upon the liaison reviews and an overview of goals and resource requests summarized by the Program Review Administrative Co-Chair. The companion summaries report consists of work submitted by the lead writer within the program review document.

Outcomes

The Program Review Committee now supports 95 program reviews. This spurred a need for additional liaisons, since it was not expected that a liaison could adequately review more than three comprehensive program reviews. A total of 34 peer liaisons were recruited, 15 of whom form the Program Review Steering Committee (replacing the Program Review Committee).

Of the College's 95 programs and service areas participating in Program Review, 91 submitted their completed documents by the deadline. Two programs requested and received a one week extension due to extenuating circumstances with staffing. These programs submitted their program review within the one week extension period. Two additional programs did not submit a program review by the deadline, nor did they request an extension. They are ineligible for resources.

As can be seen in the Annual Report, several programs and service areas did not map their goals to the College's strategic goals or ILOs and/or did not develop action plans to work towards meeting those goals. Since this is partially a problem of module structuring, the decision was made to reopen the Taskstream module to lead writers in April for a period of remediation. Any changes to the individual program reviews during this period will have no effect on reports and resource requests for this year. They will lay a better foundation for the 2015-2016 update wherein writers will discuss progress towards their goals.

Response to 2013-2014 Program Review Recommendations

In Spring 2014, the Program Review Committee conducted a thorough evaluation of the 2013-2014 Program Review and integrated planning process, sending a survey to all lead writers, liaisons, deans, and managers. Nine recommendations resulted from the analysis of the survey data. These recommendations were approved by the Committee and included in the 2013-2014 Integrated Planning Process Evaluation, which was subsequently reviewed by President's Cabinet and approved by the President. A summary of the recommendations and actions is provided below.

- ***Recommendation 1***: Separate budget request information from the Program Review new goals form and streamline the request process.
  The BARC revised its form to more closely resemble the faculty hiring request form and separated it from within the Program Review document.

- ***Recommendation 2:*** Clarify the information required for the resource allocation rubrics.
  BARC revised the rubric, which is easily accessible to lead writers, and offers training to lead writers.

- ***Recommendation 3:*** Provide additional examples of Program Review and resource request documents.
  These were provided during training or in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

- ***Recommendation 4:*** Simplify the online Program Review module with a more user-friendly interface and intuitive navigation.
  Taskstream has been adjusted as much as possible within its structure. Each section of the Program Review module has embedded instructions.

- ***Recommendation 5:*** Tailor Program Review training to the needs and experience levels of lead writers.
  Training has been divided into basic and advanced sessions and paced accordingly.

- ***Recommendation 6:*** Conduct a needs assessment for Program Review data and research support.
  Instructional data packets were revised based on feedback received via the process evaluation, and training was redesigned so that there were sessions for beginners and advanced lead writers. A follow up needs assessment will be conducted in Spring 2015.
  .

- ***Recommendation 7****:* Begin the annual Program Review cycle in summer.
  This was not possible in 2014, but additional time was added to the back end of the cycle to still have it mesh with the resource allocation cycles.

- ***Recommendation 8:*** Redesign the Program Review web site to improve access to resources (layout, organization of content, navigation).
  This has been done. There are links to training PowerPoints, FHP/CHPBARC training materials, FAQS, Taskstream tips, a visual calendar of Program Review activities and deadlines by role (lead writer, liaison, manager)

- ***Recommendation 9:*** Clarify the expectations for collaboration and communication during the Program Review process; it is uneven across programs and service areas.
  Collaboration among lead writers, other members of the program or service area, and Managers is expected throughout the process. Specifics are noted in the timeline. Additional reminders regarding expectations for roles, responsibilities, and communication among those collaborating in writing were placed within the Program Review document. Flex week trainings were planned.
  .

<u>Evaluation of 2014-2015 Program Review Process</u>

As was done last year, the Program Review Steering Committee, through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, conducts an evaluation of the process to determine its effectiveness and to plan improvements for the future. The survey participants include lead writers, deans/managers, and liaisons, along with informal feedback during Program Review Steering Committee meetings. The three resource allocation groups conduct their own evaluations, and all the feedback is incorporated into the final evaluation report and action plan. These evaluations will be conducted in March-April 2015 and will form the basis for the Committee's Spring and Summer planning and revision of the process for next year.

The Committee will create a follow-up *Integrated Planning Process Evaluation Report* regarding the evaluation and its findings and present it to the President's Cabinet in May 2015.