

Los Medanos College

Program Review Year 3 Update 2019-2020 Evaluation Report 2020

Submitted to Shared Governance Council

By The Planning Committee

May 13, 2020

The Planning Committee:

Chialin Hsieh, Chair, Senior Dean of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE)

BethAnn Robertson, Classified Senate VP, Senior Administrative Assistant of PIE,

Bob Kratochvil, Management rep, College President

Tanisha Maxwell, Management rep, VP of Student Services

Nancy Ybarra, Management rep, VP of Instruction

Scott Hubbard, Academic Senate rep, Math Faculty, TLC Co-chair

Scott Warfe, Academic Senate rep, English Faculty, Faculty Research Coordinator

Marie Arcidiacono Kaufman, Academic Senate VP, Department Chair Communication
Studies/Speech

Christopher Long, Classified Senate rep, Program Assistant

Tammy Oranje, Classified Senate rep, Financial Aid Scholarship Program Specialist

Shagoofa Khan, Student Senate VP, Student

Christian Ortiz, Student Senate VP, Student

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Purpose.....	3
II. College Mission	3
III. Program Reviews Cycle	3
IV. Program Review Year 3 (2019-2020) Update.....	4
V. District Tableau Dashboard	5
VI. The Resource Allocation Process (RAP).....	5
VII. Program Review Process Evaluation	6
VIII. Strengths and Recommended Improvements.....	11
IX. Evidentiary Documents	12
X. ACCJC Standards (to which this process contributes).....	16
XI. ACCJC Guide for Institutional-Self Evaluation	19

I. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to:

- a. Organize our current decision making and resource allocation processes including the roles and responsibilities within the program review processes.
- b. Ensure appropriate dialog and clarify how all constituency groups currently participate in decision making.
- c. Demonstrate the systematic evaluation of the College's mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality

II. College Mission

Los Medanos College (LMC) is a public community college that provides quality educational opportunities for those within the changing and diverse communities it serves. By focusing on student learning and success as our first priorities, we aim to help students build their abilities and competencies as lifelong learners. We create educational excellence through continually assessing our students' learning and our performance as an institution. To that end, we commit our resources and design our policies and procedures to support this mission. **(New Mission Statement is coming soon!)**

III. Program Reviews Cycle

Los Medanos College (LMC) conducts a comprehensive program review of all its instructional, student services, and administrative programs/units every five years. A five-year program review cycle was established in the 2017-2018 academic year and is consistent with the Title 5 requirements related to periodic updates to assessment cycles and Course Outlines of Records (COORs). The first year of the program review cycle (Year One) is the year of Comprehensive Program Review. While no program review updates are conducted in the second and fourth years (Year Two and Year Four), it should be noted that course assessments continue are conducted annually. Program Review updates are reported in the third and fifth year (Year Three and Year Five). LMC's last Comprehensive Program Review was conducted during the 2017-18 academic year. Adhering to the program review cycle, in 2019-2020 (Year Three) program review updates were reported and due in February 2020. Refer to Table 1. Program Review and Assessment Cycle for more detail.

Table 1. Program Review and Assessment Cycle

Program Review and Assessment Cycle						
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Dept. Chairs/ Deans	Checking on Courses to be assessed and updated (COORS revised and sent to Curriculum Committee for Approval) each year					
Program Review	Comprehensive		Year 3 Update		Year 5 Update	Comprehensive
Assessment	CSLO	CSLO	CSLO	CSLO	PSLO	CSLO
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 1
	COOR Updates for Course Assessed in Previous Year					
	5 Year Cycle					

IV. Program Review Year 3 (2019-2020) Update

During 2018-2019, the Planning Committee sought to amend the Program Review Year 3 Update templates based on the recommendations from [the Comprehensive Program Review Process Evaluation Report 2018](#). The draft templates were shared with constituency groups including deans, department chairs and the Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services. The templates were re-designed to be practical, meaningful, and serve as a data-driven tool that clearly represents the status of programs, outcomes, action steps, milestones, timelines, and responsible parties to keep our programs current and thriving. Additionally, the templates were revised to align with the goals and objectives in the *Vision for Success* indicators which also supports the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Institution-Set-Standards.

Following are [the 69 Program Review Updates](#) that were conducted in 2019-20 (Year Three):

- 13 administrative units
- 38 instructional units
- 5 learning community units
- 13 student services units

V. District Tableau Dashboard

The adoption of Tableau by CCCCD for faculty and staff has proven to be an exceptional tool in the query and utilization of data in department/unit planning particularly, program review. Program/unit faculty and staff now have access to view real-time data for purposes of making programmatic recommendations. In fall 2019, the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness conducted trainings in a “genius bar” format, to guide faculty and staff on how to access, use and interpret the data using Tableau. Additional Tableau trainings were conducted via [College Assembly](#), department chair meetings, [scheduled workshops](#) (at both the Pittsburg and Brentwood campuses), and individual appointments. The goal of the trainings was to ensure that faculty and staff had a consistent orientation to the Tableau application and a common understanding and interpretation of the data sets used to make program/unit recommendations.

The Planning Committee and the Shared Governance Council were also provided with current program and unit level data sets to assess overall institutional effectiveness using Tableau. These data sets were used to measure and compare program and unit needs and changes for the next review cycle.

VI. The Resource Allocation Process (RAP)

RAP is a resource request and budget augmentation process that incorporates shared governance into the core of its decision-making model. This process creates an opportunity for College constituents to explicitly document their budgetary needs in a uniform format across the College. It provides a structured, consistent criterion for the evaluation and approval of resource requests while utilizing a predictable and consistent schedule for budget development.

Based on input received from the campus community to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the resource request and allocation process, in 2018-2019 the Vice President of Business and Administrative Services (VPB&AS) in collaboration with the President’s Cabinet and Shared Governance Council, developed recommendations to revise the existing Resource Allocation Process (RAP). These revision recommendations were presented to the Academic Senate, Classified Senate and the Planning Committee for review and feedback.

Included in the revisions to the RAP process, was a more simplified and standardized procedure to the forms used to submit a resource request for review. The amended forms were divided into three separate funding categories:

- 1) Operations, supplies, equipment, services
- 2) Personnel (non-full-time faculty or classified staff)
- 3) Professional development.

The three aforementioned categories were added to the program review templates to align program/unit needs with resource requests. The Business Services Office then created a centralized budget request database to store all submitted resource requests for review and evaluation by the Shared Governance Council (SGC), President's Cabinet, Office of Instruction, Office of Student Services, and categorical funding agents. The centralized database has viewable access for all faculty and staff. Additionally, SGC approved the amendment to the resource request review and allocation cycle to twice a year (in October and April).

Lastly, a process was implemented to ensure that all allocated funds are used as outlined in the program/unit resource request. The Business Services Office requires funded programs/units to file a report detailing how the budget augmentation was used and the impact of the funding in meeting the specified goals. These reports are required to be submitted at the end of each academic year and provided to SGC for information.

VII. Program Review Process Evaluation

LMC has integrated program/unit review and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that led to the accomplishment of its mission, and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. In an effort to assess the effectiveness of this integration, an evaluation of the process was conducted following completion of the Program Review Year Three Update period (February and March 2020). This evaluation assists LMC in determining if the activities (including timeline, milestones, tasks, responsible parties, reports, etc.) were implemented as intended and resulted in projected outputs. The results strengthen LMC's ability to report on activities and provide information to inform the improvement of the next program review process. The process evaluation consists of program review validation and the program review process survey.

Program Review Validation (Spring 2020)

LMC has implemented four levels of program review validation with specific Cross-Section Theme reports prepared by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness for program/unit review and decision-making:

Program Review Validation Levels

1. The Deans review each section of the program review document then discuss the report with the department chair(s) or program/unit lead(s) each month. Following that, the Deans then certify the completion of the report and note the effectiveness of the program/unit.
2. The Deans update their respective Vice President on the strengths and challenges of their respective programs.

3. The Vice Presidents update the President's Cabinet on the strengths and challenges of their respective programs.
4. The Program Review Cross-Section Theme Reports are prepared and disseminated to appropriate committees/offices for review and feedback. **The purpose** of the theme reports is to improve our program review process—including timeline, template questions, professional development, communication, and gauging progress in attainment of goals as well as informing college leaders of possible emerging “big ideas”. A sample template was designed for the committees/offices to utilize in the summarization of their reviews of the theme reports.

Cross-Section Theme Report: Program Update, Enrollment, and Labor Market prepared for:

- a. Office of Instruction – Deans and Vice President of Instruction
- b. Office of Student Services – Deans and Vice President of Student Services
- c. Strategic Enrollment Management Committee

Cross-Section Theme Report: Vision for Success Goals prepared for:

- a. Planning Committee
- b. Academic Senate
- c. Strategic Enrollment Management Committee

Cross-Section Theme Report: Assessment prepared for:

- a. Teaching and Learning Committee
- b. Student Services Student Learning Outcomes Committee
- c. Academic Senate
- d. Strategic Enrollment Management Committee

Cross-Section Theme Report: Curriculum prepared for:

- a. Curriculum Committee
- b. Academic Senate
- c. Strategic Enrollment Management Committee

Program Review Survey Results (Spring 2020)

The Planning Committee developed and sent via e-mail the [Program Review Year 3 Update 2019-2020 Survey](#) to all faculty, classified professionals, and managers. The survey was designed to obtain input on all facets of the program review process (template, data,

timeline, training, etc.) The Resource Allocation Process (RAP) is the charge of SGC, any comments pertaining to RAP will be forwarded to SGC for review.

There were 94 respondents: 34 full-time faculty, 26 classified professionals, 10 managers, and 24 adjunct faculty. (All. Q1)

The Survey Results:

More than 85% of respondents agree or strongly agree on:

- a. the length of the program review template is reasonable,
- b. the questions in the program review are reasonable, important, and relevant, and
- c. the timeline of the program review was reasonable.

73% of respondents indicated that the feedback from their supervisors was helpful.

65% and 69% of respondents agree or strongly agree that:

- a. program review process provided departments with easy access to course offering, COORS, assessment status, Tableau Report; and
- b. program review training was helpful.

The table below summarizes the results based by percentage of those who agree or strongly agree on survey questions seven through twelve. The results in the table are also aggregated by the role of the respondent and the total number of respondents to the survey question.

Question (Q7-Q12)	Writer (N=20)	Participant but not Writer (N=20)	Total (N=40)
7. The length of the Program Review Template is reasonable.	90.0%	81.0%	85.4%
8. The questions included in the Program Review Template are reasonable, important and relevant.	85.0%	85.0%	85.0%
9. The Program Review timeline was reasonable and allowed programs/units enough time to collaborate and complete the task.	80.0%	95.0%	87.5%
10. The Program Review process was reasonable and provided departments with easy access to course offering, COORS, assessment status, Tableau Reports (Enrollment, Course Success, and Degree/Certificate).	77.8%	55.0%	65.8%
11. The Program Review trainings were helpful, expectations and information provided was clear and easy to understand.	80.0%	57.9%	69.2%
12. The feedback from your supervisor, dean, and/or vice presidents on your Program Review was helpful.	77.8%	68.4%	73.0%

The Survey Comment Summary

For those who did not participate/were not involved in/ did not contribute to program review (N=36), the summary of their comments are below: (All. Q4)

- Don't know about it
- Not been asked to participate
- Not available
- New to the job

For Instructional Units, about 77% (N=17) of respondents indicated that they liked or liked very much "chunking" each instructional program review section so that each section had its own deadline. (All. Q6)

- More manageable, take on one step at a time
- Clear and easy to understand

Most valuable aspect of program review (Q13)

- Collaboration
- Outcomes and enrollment trends
- Aligning with RAP, hiring, etc.
- Goals and planning collaboration with colleagues, prioritizing funding requests
- Setting the vision for success goals—this is a very important aspect of the program review
- It is an important part of looking back over the goals and objectives of the department to make sure we are on track and learning from our past experiences

Lessons learned included drawbacks to program review and recommended changes (Q14) and lessons learned or takeaways (Q15)

- Program Review Process
 - Program review is important to remain relevant and bring new cutting edge degrees, services and programs to LMC.
 - I learned about current status of some of the department plans. I also learned how to write these reviews.
 - Takeaway: That the next time our Department sets goals we need to be mindful of the resources it would take to complete them and whether or not the College will provide those resources.
- Chunking and Dept. Chair Meeting
 - The "chunking" of pieces due at certain times was a great way to work through the PR. Working in the labs, on the PR during DC meeting times was key! Also, having our specific department data sent to us/explained, really helped, as in the past it has been very challenging trying to locate and decipher data for PR completion.

- I really appreciate everyone's support and training. I like the Program Review "chunking" just the way it is. It gives us enough time to learn what we need to learn and work on the assignments before the due dates.
- Resource Allocation Decisions:
 - Unclear how this is used in resource allocation decisions.
 - In order to improve operations and integrate the Resource Allocation Process, requests must be tied back to Program Review. The two processes are difficult to integrate to identify resource improvements for the program.
 - The timeline gets thrown off due to the delay in the RAP process. We are still waiting to hear about our October RAP requests, yet here we are in February, unsure whether to include those same requests in our Program Review, due next month.
 - Please do not let the budget request "parking lot" become the "junk yard".
- Data/Tableau
 - Data conventions and methods need to be more defined and clear.
 - Tableau is a really powerful resource. I would like to have updated access to it (perhaps I do, and I don't know it). It takes a lot of time and review to truly understand what's there, and I'm not sure at all that I was able to use the data and Tableau itself to truly help me understand what might be beneficial for me to know about my department and program(s) going forward.
 - The use of Tableau was one of the most important tools used for this program review.
- Assessment
 - There seems to be an ongoing challenge and issue with regard to departments being able to manage the CSLO assessment and COOR updating process that has been put into place. Having management merely what amounted to scolding the department chairs and repeating things like, "the responsibility for completing the assessments and the updates is in the contract as one of the department chair's duties" (to paraphrase), again and again is not helpful. It's like a teaching scolding students who fail a test instead of using the *failure* as a reflective moment to ask: Why is this happening? Is there something I can do? Is there an issue with theory (here, the 5-year CSLO cohort cycle model) vs. practice (here, the actual implementation of the model)? Who can and should be invited to an inclusive discussion about the situation, taking an appreciative inquiry approach instead of a deficit or old-school SWOT approach?
- College wide final publication (not dept. level) is needed so we can see what is happening across campus in terms of program development and current status, trends etc. Would give us a more comprehensive snapshot of the full college.

VIII. Strengths and Recommended Improvements

The feedback received through the levels of validation and the program review survey results indicated areas of strength and areas for improvement to the process for the next program review period.

The areas of strength are:

- The program review process including templates and data (enrollment, outcomes, goal setting and alignment, update program).
- The timeline specifically, the “chunking” of sections and the inclusion of supervisor feedback.
- The trainings provided clear and concise information and guidance to complete program review.
- The alignment of the process and templates with the resource allocation process.
- The collaboration with colleagues in development of goals and program/unit planning including setting *Vision for Success* goals.
- The program update section in the template provides a method to gauge progress towards program/unit goal attainment and help to identify areas for improvement based on previous experiences.

The areas for recommended improvement are:

- The offer the trainings throughout the academic year.
- Improve the organization of the data (COOR, Assessment, Tableau) for easier user review and utilization in reporting.
- Expand upon the Tableau trainings to provide more customized support and detailed guidance.
- Investigate best practices in the creation of more faculty participation in the CSLO assessment/COOR revision process, particularly given the College's struggle in getting such processes completed on time.
- Include a glossary of commonly used terms (i.e. program set goal, assessment, action steps, student learning outcomes, retention, persistence, success, equity, theme report) so conceptually there is a shared understanding.

IX. Timeline, Tasks, Responsible Party, Cross Section Reports

Process: a series of actions or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end

Program Review Year 3 Update (2019-2020)			
Tasks			Timeline/Month
Review/Revise Program Review (PR) Unit List			Aug 2019
PR Data available			Sept 2019
Review/Revise Program Review (PR) Year 3 Template			Sept 2019
Draft PR Year 3 Template to Academic Senate, Dept. Chairs, and Program Managers for feedback			Sept 2019
PR Year 3 Template approval by the Planning Committee			Oct 3, 2019
Instructional Units	Student Services Units	Administrative Units	Oct 2019—Feb 2020
Instructional Deans provide training to support completion PR--Section 3 (Assessment) and 4 (Curriculum)			Sept 2019
Due to Instructional Dean			End of Sept 2019
Instructional Deans provide training to support completion PR--Section 1 (Program Update)			Oct 2019
Due to Instructional Dean			End of Oct 2019
Instructional Deans and PIE Dean Provide training to support completion PR--Section 2 (Vision for Success Goal Setting)--Data Analysis			Nov 2019
Due to Instructional Dean			End of Nov 2019
	Student Services PR 1 st draft		Nov 15, 2019
	Student Services PR 2 nd draft due to direct supervisors		Dec 15, 2019

Program Review Year 3 Update Evaluation Report 2020

Program Review Year 3 Update (2019-2020)			
Tasks			Timeline/Month
Instructional Units	Student Services Units	Administrative Units	Oct 2019—Feb 2020
	Student Services PR <u>final draft</u> due to direct supervisor		Jan 15, 2020
Office of Business Services provide training to support completion PR-- Section 4 Resource Request on cost estimation if needed			Feb 2020
Instructional PR final draft due to Instructional Dean	Student Services PR due to VPSS	Administrative PR due to the President	Feb 3, 2020
Program Review (PR) Year 3 Update Report Due to PIE			Feb 15, 2020
All PR Reports and Cross Section Theme Reports posted on the PR Website			March 15, 2020
Resource requests (if they have not incorporated in the PR) due to the database			March 27, 2020
Resource Allocation Reviewed and Recommended by SGC			April 2020
Validation Process			Sept 2019—Fall 2020
1. Deans review each section and discuss with dept. chairs/program leads each month, certify the completion, and note the effectiveness of the program			Sept 2019—Feb 2020
2. Deans update their VPs on the strengths and challenges on their respective programs			March 2020
3. VPs update the President's Cabinet on the strengths and challenges on their respective programs.			April 2020
4. The PR Cross Section Theme Reports are <u>disseminated</u> to the appropriate Committees.			March 2020

X. Evidentiary Documents

[Comprehensive Program Review Process Evaluation Report 2018](#)

[PR 2019-20 Year Three Update Process Website](#)

[PR Year Three Update Timeline and Tasks](#)

[College Assembly-PR Made Easy 14Oct2019](#)

[First Friday Focus 04Oct2019-PR Trainings](#)

[Administrative Units Template](#)

[Instructional Units Template](#)

[Learning Community Units Template](#)

[Student Services Units](#)

[Business Services Website-Resource Allocations](#)

[PR Theme Report Review Sample Template & TLC Example](#)

[PR 2019-20 Year Three Update Reports Website](#)

[PR Year Three Process Survey Form](#)

[PR Year Three Process Survey Results Report](#)

[PR Year Three Process Survey Results Summary](#)

XI. ACCJC Standards (to which this process contributes)

- IB1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.
- IB2. The institution defines and assess student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11)
- IB4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.
- IB5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.
- IB6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.
- IB7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.
- IB8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.
- IB9. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional

planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (ER 19)

- II.A.1 All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs.
- II.A.2 Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve instructional courses, programs and directly related services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and promote student success.
- II.A.3 The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institution's officially approved course outline.
- II.A.11 The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.
- II.A.16 The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution

systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

- II.B.1 The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library, and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.
- II.B.3 The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.
- II.C.1 The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.
- II.C.2 The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.
- II.C.3 The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

XII. ACCJC Guide for Institutional-Self Evaluation

5.4 Requirements for Evidentiary Information

iii. Evidence of Quality Program Review

- Program review cycle/timelines
- Policies on curricular review
- Evidence that SLO assessment data are used for institutional self-evaluation, planning, and improvement of teaching and learning
- Action taken (improvements) on the basis of program review
- Connection to the budgeting and resource allocation processes
- Impact on institutional effectiveness, educational quality, and student success