

PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL SUMMARY 2014

Prepared by the Program Review Committee (PRC)



Presented to College Council

December 5, 2014

Kate Pluta, Faculty Co-Chair

PRC Members

- Kim Nickell, Academic Development
- Nancy Magner, Art
- A. Todd Jones, Communication
- Bernadette Towns, FACE
- Anna Agenjo, Library
- Jennifer Johnson, Nursing
- Diane Allen, Student Services/Delano
- John Carpenter, Assessment Committee Liaison
- Billie Jo Rice, Curriculum Committee Liaison
- Kristin Rabe, Technology Services
- Meg Stidham, CSEA President or designee
- Diane Baeza, STEM/C6
- Laura Lorigo, Administrative Services
- Sue Vaughn, Enrollment Services
- Michele Bresso, Instruction
- Michael Carley, KCCCD Research
- Michael Self, Administrative Co-Chair
- Kate Pluta, Faculty Co-Chair

Purpose of Annual Report

- To summarize themes and issues that emerged in the program reviews.
- To assess the Program Review processes and make recommendations for further improvement.
- To provide information for decision-making bodies.

Opportunities

PRC views all the issues and concerns as training opportunities for the next cycle.

Findings

Commonalities
that occurred
among
several
programs

- ❑ Need for desks or seating arrangements to better accommodate students
- ❑ Technology disparity among classrooms has been reduced but still exists
- ❑ Increased number of M & O requests
- ❑ Concern about VTEA funds allocation
- ❑ Need process for requesting equipment

Findings

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.

What is an educational program?

- **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 of *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

What about other units?

Administrative
Units

Student
Affairs Units

These are identified as separate units or entities on the BC Organization Chart.

If you headed an administrative or student affairs unit that had its own box on the 8/5/14 Org Chart, you needed to do a program review for your unit.

Observations

- The instructional programs (degrees and certificates) we offered continued to evolve, but the Master List of Programs was a snapshot in time and often did not match current degrees and certificates.
- Some departments continue to view themselves as programs.

Concerns

- Some programs submitted resource requests without submitting program reviews.
- Many conclusions were superficial.
- 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.
- 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

Improving the Process

Recommendations

- Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations.
- Develop an accurate master list of programs.
- Provide more training for administrators, department chairs, and interested employees.
- Train current and incoming FCDC members in the spring using faculty who submitted model program reviews as the trainers.

More recommendations . . .

- Develop a written policy for out-of-cycle position requests.
- Post examples of effective program review elements.
- Advise authors to write conclusion as though it were an abstract.
- Continue to advocate for college researcher.
- Ensure that direct correlation between the Budget Request Form and the Budget Request Process exists.

And more recommendations . . .

- 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.
- Hold a college-wide dialog about scheduling facilities for meetings, workshops, and events.
- Develop a policy on consequences for programs that do not complete the Program Review Process.



Learn from what we do.

Continue to improve the process.

Keep these questions in mind:

If something isn't meaningful, why are we doing it?

How do we ensure that program review is directly related to resource allocation → making it meaningful?



More questions?