Program Review Annual Summary
Fall 2018
Prepared by the Program Review Committee

Program Review Members:

Chairs: Stephen Waller, Dean of Instruction, Admin. Co-Chair; Kimberly Nickell, ACDV, Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin Rabe, Media Services, Classified Co-Chair
Members: Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker-Collins, Philosophy; Brenda Nyagwachi, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; Heather Baltis, Agriculture; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Nicole Hernandez, Nursing; Keri Wolf, English; Jennifer Johnson, Nursing (Curriculum Liaison); Scott Dameron, Health & PE; Klint Rigby, Engineering and Industrial Technology; Jason Dixon, Engineering and Industrial Technology; Katie Ganster, Biology; Brian Sivesand, Theater; Brent Wilson, Assessment Liaison
Administrators: Michelle Bresso, Dean of Instruction
Sue Vaughn, Child Development Center;
Classified: Meg Stidham, CSEA designee
Elisabeth Sampson, SGA Senator 8

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 119 program reviews:
  - ▪ Annual Updates Instruction 45
  - ▪ Comprehensive Updates Instruction 21 (including BA)
  - ▪ Annual Updates Non-Instruction 37
  - ▪ Total 103 submitted
- ➤ 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 Budget, ISIT, Facilities, Assessment, and Curriculum committees; FCDC; College Council; CTE; and the College President in the resource allocation process.

  - ▪ **Classified Position Requests = 42**
  - ▪ **Faculty Position Requests = 77**
  - ▪ **Facilities Requests = 54**
  - ▪ **ISIT Tech Requests = 90 (10 funded, 80 unfunded)**

- **Other Equip Requests = 30**
- **Budget Development Forms Completed = 25**
- **Certificates Reported = 29**
- **CTE Reported = 33**
- **Curriculum Reviews Reported = 19 (comprehensive)**
- **Assessments – 73**

Changes to the 2018-19 Cycle:

- ➢ We created a single naming convention for all documents. Each dean/chair received his or her forms via email.

  - This helped in getting a larger number of correct forms back.

- ➢ Created a "Welcome to your Program Review" letter.
- ➢ Restructured the handbook into a streamlined PowerPoint with links and contact information, which was emailed to deans/chairs as well as making it available on the PRC and District Program Review webpages.
- ➢ List of programs was more conclusive this year. We were able to designate each program type: Instructional, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Administration.
- ➢ Assessment Form was restructured from last year as the Assessment Committee transitions to eLumen. The form directly relates to the assessment process in eLumen.
- ➢ Pilot of eLumen. PRC learned much about the process and is ready for a smooth transition to have all instructional programs do the program review process within eLumen.

Program Review Annual Update: 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 2018 reporting year, the Program Review Committee identified the following emergent themes. Themes and issues do not necessarily reflect shared experiences among all programs, but certainly emerged as common among multiple units.

- ✓ The instructional programs (degrees and certificates) we offered continue to evolve. The Master List of Programs we used this cycle was a better snapshot in time; however, we still need to continuously monitor and evaluate current degrees and certificates for validity.
- ✓ Emailed packets with accurate forms with specific naming conventions; PRC continued receiving outdated forms; however, there were fewer than previous cycles. This will be remedied through eLumen.
- ✓ Some programs took immediate advantage of feedback and resubmitted their program reviews or requested to meet with co-chairs to gain more insight.
- ✓ Resources are not goals. They can be part of the action plan, but they are not a goal in and of themselves.
- ✓ If a resource form is completed, the resource should be mentioned in goals/action plan.
- ✓ Received resources were not assessed
- ✓ Conclusions were better drafted.
- ✓ AUOs not well developed or included for non-instructional programs
- ✓ Trend data not used effectively to analyze program.
- ✓ Goals: lack of action plans. Too many ongoing goals. Not making staff or faculty request a goal. It can be part of the action plan to request. Goals student or campus centered, not resource centered.
- ✓ Relate the program or administrative outcomes to the institutional outcomes.
- ✓ Give programs that are not instructional some training…spring training should help them develop a better program review.
- ✓ Can we speak to a program that is less than two years old…is there a way to identify that it is a new program early in the review to allow PRC to give relevant and constructive feedback.
- ✓ Training for instruction and non-instructional
- ✓ Who makes the call on space allocation? How would two areas wanting one space be resolved? Look at the Education Masterplan along with the Facilities Masterplan
- ✓ Encourage to answer NA when it isn't relevant.
- ✓ Categorical budget programs don't have to submit HR form for staffing

Outcomes based on the process:

As a result of the Program Review process, we are affecting change:

- We look forward to the smooth transition of all instructional programs doing their program reviews in eLumen in the 2019-20 cycle.
- Program Review, Assessment, and Curriculum will all have transitioned into eLumen.
- The Program Review Committee has become a strong repository of evidence that can be accessed for accreditation purposes.
- Our systems are well integrated. We work effectively with other committees (Assessment, Curriculum, and Budget).
- Campus culture continues to shift positively
    - As faculty and staff change their perspectives on program review, regarding the process as an opportunity to promote educational excellence and improve instruction and services to students, they are affecting change within their programs and across campus.
    - The resource acquisition process and budgeting process is more fully understood and integrated.
    - The resources allocation/prioritization process has become more transparent.
    - There is a better understanding among faculty and staff of the implications of the program review process and its important role in accreditation. This has been vocalized within committee meetings across campus.
- Data
    - Steve Waller initiated the development of additional data with Amber Hroch through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This is leading up toward more effective and accessible data

Opportunities:

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

1. Clarify the importance of assessing resources received from previous cycle and the impact on the program.

2. Facilities Requests: programs had a better understanding of the process and the difference between a work order and a request.

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. Remind programs that these elements can be part of the action plan but not the goal or fulfillment of mission.

4. Overall, the responses varied in their consistencies. Some were very strong, with many model examples this year. Others were not as robust, and some conclusions could have been fleshed out. Again, PRC can create better examples/models.

5. Because every program serves students in some way, maybe reframe how we ask programs to describe the students they serve, i.e. type of student, what is their focus, CTE, transfer, etc. Remind student services and administrative services serve ALL students.

Recommendations: Program Review's Future Practices:

1. Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations.
2. Continue toward the accuracy of master list of programs.
3. Develop a 3-year comprehensive cycle for Student Affairs and administrative units.
4. Develop workshops to help admin units develop strong AUOS
5. Data workshops
6. Buy in, outreach, training, constituencies will continue.
7. Compliance with ACCJC standards
8. Always looking to improve efficiency of the process through feedback, surveys, self-reflection to support a successful institution and student success.
9. Committee will address the need to meet with deans of admin units and other programs to help in classifying special programs and programs that do not lead to degrees.
10. Provide more training for administrators, current and incoming department chairs, and interested employees.
11. Develop a written policy for out-of-cycle position requests.

12. Continue to post examples of effective program review elements.
13. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were an summary.
14. Engage initiatives to participate in the program review process.
15. If eLumen is not available for admin units and non-instructional programs, PRC will provide return receipt email for those programs
16. Next year before program review is due, verify program title for each department. Include verification of programs that are not offered.
17. Provide example sections of program reviews.
18. Continue to provide training for administrators, department chairs, and interested employees that are specific to those areas. Offer drop-in workshops at a variety of times.
19. Will generate a survey in early spring 2019 to provide data for the closing the loop document.

Summary Report Trend:

- ➢ Over the past three Program Review cycles 2016-18, the number of programs included in the Program Review process has increased:
  - 2016 107 programs-104 submissions
  - 2017 113 programs-110 submissions
  - 2018 119 programs-103 submissions

Conclusion:

The Program Review Committee has already developed a plan to address many of the opportunities and self-evaluated recommendations discussed in this summary report and have started the process toward refining the program review forms and the process to continue efforts to be streamlined, relevant, and easily accessible with language that engages editors in thoughtful dialogue.

The Program Review process continues to evolve, and its contributions to the resource allocation, the accreditation processes, and ultimately student success continue to grow and strengthen. The perception of Program Review is at an all-time high. This is evident through the dialog about the importance of program review at governance committee meetings.

The Program Review Committee received praise from the ACCJC visiting team, we piloted the program review process within eLumen and worked through the issues, and we are working more closely with the Assessment, Curriculum, and Budget Committees as well as CTE to become more of a system.

The committee is committed to be an agent of change. We have strengthened connections across the BC campus with other committees. We have set and achieved goals to create an effective Program Review process and to complete the highest quality of work to meet the stringent standards of ACCJC, the accreditation process, and to represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of programs on the Bakersfield College campus, recognizing the mutual dependency of programs and activities, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and scholarship, an effective administration, and adequate facilities and support services, all of which contribute to the success of our student body.

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 and the following information is/will be available online at the Program Review Committee page:

https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview

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

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