The President's Cabinet reviewed, discussed, and provided feedback to its members on the program reviews for the Administrative Services units. Included with the feedback was their input on the overall process and suggestions for improvement. The feedback was shared among the President's Cabinet.

Resource Allocation Processes

The Vice President of Business & Administrative Services (VPB&AS) presented the recommended revisions to the Resource Allocation Process (RAP) to the President's Cabinet, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Planning Committee and Shared Governance Council during the spring 2018 semester. The VPB&AS reviewed and discussed the recommended revisions, and requested feedback. The input received was shared with President's Cabinet and the Shared Governance Council. Final approval for the modified Resource Allocation Process will be placed on the agenda (as an action item) for the September 12, 2018 Shared Governance Council meeting.

April – July 2018

Process Evaluation

Purpose: The College integrated its program review and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that led to the accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. A process evaluation was needed after the completion of the comprehensive program review period to determine whether the comprehensive program review "activities"—including timeline, tasks, responsible party, reports, etc. were implemented as intended and resulted in certain outputs. The results of this evaluation will strengthen our ability to report on our activities and the information will be utilized to improve our next program review process.

Method: The Office of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness surveyed the program/unit leads, interviewed, and conducted focus groups: (a) the Academic Senate President; (b) all Deans; (c) Department Chairs/Leads; (d) Student Services Managers; (e) TLC leaders; (f) President Cabinet Members for feedback on the following questions:

1. How well is the process working? To what extent is the process being implemented as designed?
2. What were the kinds of problems encountered in delivering? Was there enough resources from the beginning to do it well? What were the barriers and/or enablers to the implementation?
3. Recommendations/Suggestions

Results: The feedback on the overall process was positive and indicated that this program review process created opportunities for dialogue. Reportedly, the length of the template worked well however, the quality in responses varied. For example, in sections that included guided questions the response quality was better than the responses to questions in other sections that were open-ended and less guided. It was also noted that a section on innovation was not included in the template nor any questions surrounding the outcome or "take-away" for the program/unit upon completing their program review. Additionally, the responses in the CSLO section were minimal as it was not as prescriptive. In addition, the section pertaining to the advisory boards was sometimes difficult to address as some advisory boards are informational therefore there is no impact to note for the program/unit.

PSLO Assessment

Program Assessment is a good source of data and should be built into conversations on data for program review. The information contained in the Program Review Submission Tool (PRST) that was required to adequately respond to specific sections was difficult to access and affected the quality of those responses (i.e. prior years' program reviews, PSLO assessments, CSLO assessments, etc.). There is still some confusion for programs with multiple certificates and degrees, as became evident when reviewing the PSLO sections and assessment reports. Some programs/units copied and pasted their PSLOs for one certificate/degree to all of their certificates and degrees in their program/unit. In most cases, the same PSLO for one certificate/degree does not apply to another. Improved technology and tracking of Course Outlines of Records (COORs), CSLOs and PSLOs may help ease some of the frustration experienced when answering these sections. Clearer and more widespread communication needs to be developed to delineate the role of the Assessment Coordinator from that of program review, as many faculty thought the coordinator would assist them with completing their program reviews. The new enterprise software technology tool may also assist in delineating the role of Assessment Coordinator from that of Program Review Coach.

Template

The process and template promoted dialogue both within most departments and with their program/unit Dean; however, it was also apparent that in some programs/units no dialogue was initiated. Additional guidance and training on the analysis and goal-setting sections with program/unit leads in advance may help increase the quality of responses in these sections. By revising the questions to become more prescriptive and including additional questions pertaining to goal setting such as – activities, timeline, metrics/data, etc. – the program/unit may develop more meaningful, focused and measurable goals. In addition to offering professional development on goal setting and alignment, activities should also be designed on how to interpret and utilize data. Restructuring the template questions so the program/unit lead must review their data when setting their goals may also result in improved goal setting and alignment. There should be flexibility and agility within the process and template for program/units to adjust their goals if necessary to allow for changes/updates to personnel, initiatives and data. The Deans will be meeting with their program/unit leads over the next two to three years to develop, implement and assess their established goals.

The template should also include more reflective questions that instruct the program/unit lead to "look back" at the previous year(s) first by reviewing their data, activities, accomplishments, disappointments, assessment(s), etc. and incorporate their reflective findings in their program review responses. After taking a "look back" the program/unit lead will take a "look forward" and design their future goals. Restructuring the program review process to incorporate a year of reflection in which broad discussions can occur and program/unit leads can review the activities, data and accomplishments from the previous year. The data sets for Student Services was minimal; consequently, it was difficult for the program/unit to utilize the data provided to complete their program review. If we begin to develop more consistent measures/data sets now including refined data tools and metrics from the state, it will result in more relevant and useful data for the next program review period.

The Deans indicated the feedback and certification phase of the program review process absorbed a significant amount of time specifically for those units who did not access or utilize the data and did not give the time and effort needed to complete a thorough comprehensive program review.