

Program Review Annual Summary
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

There is a lack of meeting space and difficulty in scheduling facilities. Prior to making a request there is no way to determine room capacity or availability.

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 page 3), 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 a degree path. There were none.

Observations based on the process:

- 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.
- Names of degrees on the master list did not always match the degrees identified by departments in the program review process.
- In some cases, the list identified departments with two degrees, but the departments wrote about one degree with two emphases.
- Some degrees and certificates were officially added or deleted after the 8.21.14 Master List.

Concerns:

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

1. Some programs submitted resource requests without submitting program reviews.
2. Many conclusions were superficial.
3. 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.

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 administrators, department chairs, and interested employees.
4. Train current and incoming FCDC members in the spring using faculty who submitted model program reviews as the trainers.
5. Develop a written policy for out-of-cycle position requests.
6. Post examples of effective program review elements.
7. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were an abstract.
8. Continue to advocate for college researcher.
9. 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.
10. Ensure that direct correlation between the Budget Request Form and the Budget Request Process exists.
11. Hold a college-wide dialog about scheduling facilities for meetings, workshops, and events.
12. Develop a policy on consequences for programs that do not complete the Program Review Process.

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 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, page 5
2. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses, pages 6-11
3. List of Model Annual Updates and Comprehensive Reviews, page 12

Appendices available online only:

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

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. I became 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 been.
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 access and 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. 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.
4	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).
5	CPR	
7	AU	None
8	AU	none at this time
13	AU	Is there a form to request Professional Development? 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?
15	CPR	
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. 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).
22	CPR	
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>