Program Review: Senate Proposal for Change

Issue: Program Review must be linked to institutional planning and resource allocation processes.

Rationale:
1. To make Program Review a meaningful process.
2. To meet Accreditation requirements: "Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples" (*Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part I: Program Review* available at http://www.accjc.org/all-commission-publications-policies).
3. To meet Recommendations 1 and 4 from the Accrediting Commission (based on the 2006 Self Study and available at http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/about/accreditation/)

- **RECOMMENDATION 1**
  In order to meet the standard and fully implement the planning processes that the college has put into place, the team recommends that the college provide training on the various planning processes, including use of data in unit planning and program review, and set an implementation timeline that ensures completion of a full cycle of planning and broad-based evaluation **(Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7).**
- **RECOMMENDATION 4**
  In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the college develop and articulate an institutional strategic planning framework with links between campus planning, assessment, program review, curriculum and budget processes. In addition, the college should develop a system to provide information on programs, finances and these processes on a continuous basis to planning participants **(Standard II.A, II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.C, II.C.1.c and III.D).**

Background/Institutional History: The college has struggled to link planning, program review, and resource allocation. Many attempts have been made to solve this problem. The Budget & Program Review Committee (B&PR) was split into several parts: Faculty Chairs and Directors Council (FCDC), College Council, and Budget Committee. While FCDC and College Council continue to function, the budget committee has, until this semester, been an ad hoc committee with different charges and membership from year to year. College presidents have typically relied on unit plans and not program reviews as they made budget allocations. Now the Budget Committee is a standing committee with a specific charge. However, the connection between unit plans and programs reviews is still unclear. Program Reviews are reported to College Council but not connected to the budget or planning process.

The 2006 visiting accreditation team from ACCJC recognized the problem and issued Recommendations 1 and 4 to address it. In response, the college stated the following in its 2009 Midterm Report: "By the end of Spring 2010, Program Review forms will have undergone a major revision to align the content and terminology with its corresponding elements in the unit plan. After changing the content and formatting, the next step will be to put all the forms and materials online (*2009 Bakersfield College Midterm Report*, page 15, available at http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/about/accreditation/).

At the end of fall 2010, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) asked the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) to work on aligning the unit plan and program review processes. Current and past co-chairs of IEC serve on ASC, as do other IEC members.

Kate Pluta, Accreditation Steering Committee Co-chair, April 13, 2011

Drafts of the proposal have been presented to the Academic Senate, College Council, IEC, and the Budget Committee. College Council has representatives from FCDC. The proposal will go to FCDC soon, with a presentation at the meeting on April 29.

Opposing Views: (for illustrative purposes only—there may be others)

Why do we have to change?
Why does the unit plan have to change?
Why does the program review process have to change?

Response:
The college needs to link planning, program review, and resource allocation.

The unit plan, with a few additional questions and a change in how it is reviewed and responded to, meets the requirements of program review.

Every year, one of the following clusters (Basic Skills, Gen Ed/Transfer, CTE, Library and Student Support Services, and Administrative Services) would meet to work on Integrated Program Review (IPR) to discuss how they fit together to improve institutional effectiveness and to "refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning" (*Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part I: Program Review* available at http://www.accjc.org/all-commission-publications-policies).

Solution: Please see the attached FAQ's, which detail the Annual Program Review proposal.

Kate Pluta, Accreditation Steering Committee Co-chair, April 13, 2011