# Summary of Program Review Annual Update Process and Outcomes

**Fall 2014**

**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 89 instructional programs and the 16 administrative or student service units (non-instructional) across the College.
* 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; 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 2014 reporting year, the Program Review Committee identified the following emergent themes. Please note that these themes and issues do not necessarily reflect shared experiences among all programs, but certainly emerged as common among multiple units.

1. Need for desks or seating arrangements that better accommodate students
2. Technology disparity in facilities—fewer comments than last year but still exists
3. Increased number of Maintenance & Operations requests
4. Concern about how VTEA funds were utilized and allowable use of those funds
5. Need for process for requesting equipment

**Outlier**

The lack of meeting space along with scheduling of facilities. There isn’t a way to see how many a room can accommodate, nor determine room availability without requesting and being denied.

### Changes to Annual Program Review Process:

One of the simplest things—the number of instructional programs we have and the number of program reviews turned in—shows a discrepancy. We started with a master list of 89 degrees and 41 Certificates of Achievement dated August 21, 2014. We should have received at least 89 program reviews. Our final reading list shows 55 “clumps” of degree and certificate granting entities. Following the Title 5 definition (see below), 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. Our directions in the CPR were less clear. Regardless, there should have been some program reviews of certificates that stand alone, i.e., they do not lead to degree path. There were none.

Many potential reasons for the discrepancy between the expected and received numbers exist, but here are a few:

* Some departments continued to view themselves as programs—and it didn’t seem to matter how many degrees and certificates they offered, they were doing one program review.
* Some of the confusion stems from the definition of ‘program.’ See Title 5 definition below.
* Some of the confusion may stem from the Annual Update and Comprehensive Program Review directions (also below).
* At least one discipline seemed confused about its own degree.
* Disciplines that offer two degrees called them one with two emphases.
* Some of the confusion stems from the master list of programs.
* Some degrees and certificates were officially deleted after the 8.21.14 Master List.

**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 was the first year to require Certificates of Achievement to participate in the program review process.

Here are the instructions from the Annual Update form:

IX. Certificates of Achievement:

Programs with stackable certificates fill out the following form.

Stand alone certificates fill out the entire Annual Update.

Here are the directions for the Comprehensive Program Review

I. Instructional Programs only***:***

1. List the degrees and Certificates of Achievement the program offers.
2. If your program offers both an A.A. and an A.S. degree in the same subject, please explain the rationale for offering both.
3. If your program offers a local degree in addition to the ADT degree, please explain the rationale for offering both.

**Concerns:**

1. Some programs submitted resource requests without submitting program reviews.
2. Many conclusions were not in depth.
3. Some areas requested faculty, staff, and an increase in budget in order to be able to fulfill the college mission. Does this mean that they can’t do the job if the request is not granted?
4. Overall, the responses were inconsistent. Some were very strong—there were more model examples this year. Others seemed halfhearted, as if they were completed only because they were required. A few devoted their conclusions to a criticism of the process.

**Recommendations for Future Practice:**

1. Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations.
2. Develop an accurate master list of programs.
3. Provide more training for new administrators, department chairs, and interested employees.
4. Due to Chair changes, train FCDC in the Spring using faculty who submitted model program reviews as the trainers.
5. Suggest that a written policy be developed for out of cycle retirement/terminations.
6. Post examples of effective justifications, trend data analysis, etc.
7. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were an abstract.
8. 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 and Comprehensive Reviews

Appendices available online only:

1. Annual Updates
2. Comprehensive Program Reviews
3. Best Practices
4. Faculty Position Requests
5. Classified Position Requests
6. ISIT Requests
7. M & O Requests

# APPENDIX 1

**Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Results Summary, Fall 2014**

A total of 24 responses were gathered from the program review/annual update evaluation. The complete set of responses appears below after the summary. The second column (type) shows CPR for comprehensive program reviews and AU for those responses coming from those who completed annual updates. There were a total of 14 responses from people completing CPRs and 10 from those completing AUs.

Below is a brief summary, including trends in responses to each of the six questions. For a couple of questions, there were no clear trends or patterns in the responses (multiple people saying the same or similar things) but some individual comments may provide useful information nonetheless.

One comment that was not a pattern in any one question, but which was mentioned across multiple questions was the idea of providing an example of completed documents and/or forms that might be used to see what the committee expects.

In the below summary, the number of substantive comments is included in the parentheses for each question. These exclude non-responses such as “NA” or “No Comment”.

**Benefits of annual update process (22 comments)**

* Provided an opportunity for reflection
* Allowed for team-building, getting to know about what colleagues do
* Setting of goals

**Suggestions for future improvement (20 comments)**

* Link forms, data together, provide links in forms
* Need a mechanism to research/look up costs for M&O/IT requests
* Need more time, more clarity on timeline

**Additional/different data that would be helpful (12 comments)**

* Several useful comments were made, but no specific patterns emerged

**How forms could be improved (10 comments)**

* Several useful comments were made, but no specific patterns emerged other than a need for clarity in the professional development forms

**Comments regarding training (15 comments)**

* Training sessions very helpful, useful
* Did not attend, need more opportunities to attend, encourage/mandate attendance

**Additional comments (9 comments)**

* Several useful comments were made, but no specific patterns emerged

**Survey and analysis provided by Michael Carley, Associate Director, Institutional Research and Reporting, Kern Community College District**

# APPENDIX 2

## Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses

**2. What did you find beneficial about the process?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 1 | CPR | Chance to get feedback before it was due. |
| 2 | AU | establishing goals for the year |
| 3 | CPR | Absolutely nothing. |
| 4 | CPR | Reviewing the previous year. Developing a sense of where we've been and where we're going. Tying budget to performance. |
| 5 | CPR | It helped to establish some coherence between administration concerns and faculty concerns. |
| 6 | CPR | It allowed our department to showcase what we do well and where we can improve. |
| 7 | AU | Allows the department to reflect and set goals. |
| 8 | AU | provided an opportunity to reflect on the program and assess goals, goal achievement, data, and areas of improvement. |
| 9 | CPR | provides an opportunity to view the program progress and areas of needed improvement...the bigger picture outside the program |
| 10 | CPR | People in my department learned more about what others in the department were doing--committee work, professional development, faculty awards, new techniques in the classroom to name a few. |
| 11 | AU | Caused us to discuss our AUOs and update our planning. |
| 12 | CPR | It allowed us to work together as a team, discover weakness in our area, and articulate in writing things that we have been discussing for years. |
| 13 | AU | It was good reflection on what we do. |
| 14 | AU | self reflection of the Dept. |
| 16 | CPR | Learning what other disciplines in my area are doing. |
| 17 | CPR | The instructions indicate that only "brief and constructive" comments are appreciated. This precludes my further participation in the survey.  |
| 18 | AU | It allows one to reflect on the program in terms of weaknesses and strengths. The process lends itself to finding ways to improve the particular program.  |
| 19 | AU | Gave us direction in our department as well as help communicate our needs to administration. |
| 20 | AU | it was my first time. Ibecame familiar with each of the components. |
| 21 | CPR | As a new adjunct, I enjoyed getting to meet faculty members. Doing the data analysis also provided some insight into the English program. |
| 23 | AU | Wasn't significantly different than before. |
| 24 | CPR | Working with colleagues and learning more about how the college operates. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**3. How can we improve the process in the future?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 1 | CPR | This process is so huge, I don't know. However, I think if we could keep the same forms for the next few years that would help. Even if they are not perfect, I would rather get comfortable with them before changing them |
| 2 | AU | if the attachments for the various requests had the same look and did not need to repeat questions from the main form.  |
| 3 | CPR | Make it more clear what the three year timeline is. Some of the questions seemed to indicate we were looking at the last three years while others were looking at the next three years, so it felt like a six year comprehensive review instead of three. |
| 4 | CPR | The website (unavailable when I did mine) is a big improvement. Having reps available to answer questions and review documents (like Carpenter and Rice do for curriculum).  |
| 5 | CPR | There could perhaps be a more detailed template to guide the review process. |
| 6 | CPR | Several areas of the document were confusing and ambiguous. Obtaining costs for IT and M&O requests is virtually impossible. I sent requests for quotes and never received a response. |
| 7 | AU | For equipment requests it would be helpful for M&O to have a website where we could look up the costs of carpeting, desks, chairs, etc. Also the same would be helpful for IT requests |
| 9 | CPR | Link the forms within the document. Our forms were submitted but there is no way to provide the attachments directly into the document. |
| 10 | CPR | It would be nice if we were given a packet of the CURRENT Bakersfield College Mission, college strategic goals, and the college master plan. |
| 12 | CPR | Having one or two meetings that are held at 4 or 5pm where departments come and are given a "how to" workshop. Our department chair is not the most reliable or competent, as such, it made it difficult for us when it should not have ben. |
| 13 | AU | na |
| 14 | AU | Administrative input and clarification of Dept's that do not have an Educational Dean |
| 15 | CPR | This is an enormous amount of work asked of faculty who may or may not (not in this case) have any connection to the program.  |
| 16 | CPR | Have a required department meeting for one morning or afternoon where classes are cancelled to facilitate all faculty attendance. |
| 18 | AU | At this point, no improvement |
| 19 | AU | Follow up on some of our department needs as mentioned in the program review such as needed new faculty. |
| 20 | AU | Figure out a way for all these random reports and forms and requirements and plans and faculty requests and institutional data and curriculum review and justifications to be linked for common accessand flow through. We as an institution waste so much human effort, it's embarrassing to me. |
| 21 | CPR | More time, perhaps, but that's always limited. Trying to get more people involved? I don't know. I thought it went well.  |
| 22 | CPR | The process does not include a form to request equipment for the labs on campus. There is an IT form for computers, etc., a form for M&O and a budget increase form but I believe a specific form for equipment is necessary to make the college community aware of the great need for equipment specific to the programs on campus.  |
| 23 | AU | Don't know, honestly. We just sit down and do it, without contemplating whether there is a better way. Don't want to go back and spend time at this point cogitating about such when there is so much else to be done. |
| 24 | CPR | It seems like we did not have a lot of time to get it done, although our program review was a success, so maybe less time was a good motivator! |
|  |  |  |

**4. What, if any, other data would you find helpful in preparing future program reviews or annual updates?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 1 | CPR | I don't know how much costs are considered. If costs are considered then it would be good to know if there is a suggested ceiling (I am thinking of equipment, rooms, etc. not faculty costs) |
| 2 | AU | if we are able to request student demographic information.  |
| 4 | CPR | You tell me. |
| 5 | CPR | It would be nice if there was a way to integrate student concerns more comprehensively. |
| 6 | CPR | Transfer data. How do we compare with other similar departments across the district/state. |
| 7 | AU | In our area we are both instructional and provide student services. The data from the district could be clearer in terms of courses vs. services  |
| 8 | AU | may be have those recognized as exemplary programs, participate in a panel Q/A during flex. They could be asked questions about how data was used, how they were able to get department participation, etc.  |
| 10 | CPR | Data for some pilot courses was unavailable. |
| 12 | CPR | seminars  |
| 13 | AU | na |
| 14 | AU | Individual class data available on ODS...make it accessible to those who don't work with ODS data on a consistent basis |
| 15 | CPR | No data specific to this program was provided for preparing the program review. It would be helpful to have data provided specific to this program so that we do not have to go out and search for data.  |
| 18 | AU | How data relates to CuriuNET and help to make sure program review data matches CuriuNET data. |
| 19 | AU | Same as 3 above. |
| 20 | AU | We ought to be able to populate data for each department rather than, gather it over and over again. |
| 21 | CPR | N/A |
| 23 | AU | Nothing comes to mind. |
|  |  |  |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 5 | CPR | Fortunately our program had a veteran at Trend Data Analysis; that seemed to be the most daunting section. |
| 6 | CPR | I would like an area that would allow the department to request equipment.  |
| 7 | AU | Much improved over past--the handbook was helpful |
| 8 | AU | have the questions on the form bolded or italicized.  |
| 10 | CPR | The Classified Position Request Form needs to have something on it for when we need to just add hours or months to an existing position.  |
| 12 | CPR | Sometimes questions were only relevant to certain areas- if that was better disclosed in writing that would be nice |
| 13 | AU | I wasn't sure how to answer Professional Development |
| 18 | AU | NONE |
| 19 | AU | Our department chair was clear in writing the review and supplying us with copies. |
| 20 | AU | It is not easy to determine how to use the "check" boxes on the forms |
| 21 | CPR | N/A |
| 22 | CPR | Samples of completed professional development forms on the web would be helpful. Quite honestly with the length of the comprehensive review process we did not have input on this form.  |
| 23 | AU | They were all OK. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**6. What comments do you have (positive or negative) regarding the training sessions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 1 | CPR | Again, the feedback was wonderful. I wish we had longer to prepare in the fall semester--but that is probably not possible. |
| 2 | AU | provide an completed A example  |
| 3 | CPR | The training session was the best part about it. The process was a bit overwhelming, but the training made it seem realistic and doable. |
| 5 | CPR | The training was positive. Where there wasn't time to answer every question or concern, we were at least pointed to where to find those answers. |
| 7 | AU | Training sessions were very helpful. I would strongly recommend PRC strongly encourage all new chairs to attend |
| 8 | AU | I didn't attend training |
| 12 | CPR | Never knew there were any-Im sure that was passed to DC's but did not get to us |
| 13 | AU | I am surprised that more people don't come to the training sessions |
| 14 | AU | Sometimes "presenters" assume everyone in the room have done have been a part of the process before...that is not true |
| 16 | CPR | Have training for all faculty so they may not only appreciate the effort put into the comprehensive reviews, but so they may also contribute more knowledgeably on the process. This requires a time when all faculty are available. |
| 18 | AU | Good Training sessions |
| 19 | AU | Did not participate in the training sessions. |
| 20 | AU | no comment |
| 21 | CPR | I really enjoyed the workshop and getting to work closely with faculty members. As a complete newbie to the process, however, I was craving a bit more context and direction.  |
| 23 | AU | Don't recall that I went to one. |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Type** | **Comment** |
| 1 | CPR | Try to keep the forms simple--even if they are not perfect. |
| 2 | AU | thank you for everything you do for this institution. i know it is not an easy task.  |
| 4 | CPR | My last big program review was help up as an exemplar. My most recent one was found to be problematic. In my opinion, you need to norm and have your assessment standards normed. I think showcasing the exemplary reviews is a backhanded way of blacklisting those found wanting, which is a negative reinforcement. I know that they will stay, but I think it's a bad idea.  |
| 5 | CPR | Perhaps faculty involvement in the process could be more clearly incentivized (meaning merely that heads of departments might have a clear script that details the benefits to come down the road for a well written, team-driven review). |
| 7 | AU | None |
| 8 | AU | none at this time |
| 13 | AU | Is there a form to request Professional Development? |
| 15 | CPR | This process should be an administrative function. Why are faculty (who have no authority to make decisions or access to information) asked to complete this process?  |
| 18 | AU | NONE |
| 19 | AU | NA |
| 20 | AU | I beleive we have a good team. They just need a more collaborative type of information integration. |
| 21 | CPR | I thought it was fun. That may sound strange but I like doing this kind of stuff. Thanks for organizing everything. |
| 22 | CPR | Quite honestly, the budget change form is not helpful at all. Our faculty do not believe that this form makes any change what so ever on the budget allocated to the department. This form and its justification does not seem useful (of course it should be useful). |
| 23 | AU | Nada... |

# APPENDIX 3:

## List of Model Annual Updates and Comprehensive Program Reviews

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Annual Updates** | **Comprehensive Program Reviews** |
| Academic Development | Communication |
| Chemistry | English |
| Counseling & Advising | English for Multilingual Students (EMS) |
| Electronics Technology | Nursing—Vocational  |
| Library | Radiologic Technology |
| Nursing—Registered  |  |
| Physics/Astronomy |  |
| Sociology |  |

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