# Program Review Year 3 Update Survey Summary

3.30.2020

The Planning Committee requested to evaluate Program Review Year 3 Update process via survey on February 6, 2020 committee meeting and the survey items were discussed and determined. (Survey Form). The Survey has been emailed to the LMC all employees on February 24, 2020 and the Survey closed by March 27, 2020. Three reminders have sent during this duration. (Emails)

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

Of these 94 respondents, 25% (N=23) indicated that they were either department chair or program lead who completed the program review; 38% (N=36) indicated that they did not participate/involved in/contribute to program review; 37% (N=35) indicated that they were not writers but participate in/contribute to program review. (All. Q2 and Q3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | N |
| Department chair or Program lead who completed the program review (Writer) | 23 |
| Participant/Involve in program review but not Writer | 36 |
| Did not participate in program review | 35 |

For those who did not participate/involved in/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 those 58 respondents who participate/involved in the program review (N=23+35=58), 73% were involved in instructional unit program review, 23% were in student services/learning community program review, and 20% were in the administrative unit program review. (All. Q5)

For Instructional Unit, about 77% (N=17) of respondents indicated that they like or like it very much the “chunking” that each instructional program review section has its own deadline. (All. Q6)

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

We would like to compare the **percentage of agree or strongly agree** with the respondents who were the writer vs. who were participants but not writer. (All. Q7-Q12)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Percentage of agree or strongly agree  on the question | | |
| Question | 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% |

**Comments Summary:**

Length of the template (Q7)

* Program Review template covered all of the important information with clear instruction.
* Template can be made shorter.
* Suggestion: It's quite long. I know we're trying to do a lot with one doc and I appreciate that but some of the cutting and pasting tasks feel like busy work and that there are other ways that this information could be provided. Like: Here is the list of CSLO reports that are missing, what is your plan for getting those done, who is doing them? Instead of me having to comb through the list against the list of courses and figure out what was missing. The Goals update: That was easy and brief.

Questions are reasonable, important and relevant (Q8)

* The questions in the Program Review Template seemed difficult to align with metrics.
* Suggestion: With regard to productivity questions and enrollment items, this should be valuable to the new SEM and hopefully will inform that group - which seems management heavy - in that SEM should be supporting departments in outreach, communication, and classroom scheduling (one of those calculations shows that the number of available seats in a classroom can adversely affect our productivity; however, faculty are not responsible for the number of desks that management has tried to cram into rooms, which by the way adversely affects ones ability to implement active and interactive learning...!)

Timeline was reasonable (Q9)

* Not enough time to complete
* More than enough time to complete
* The timeline felt reasonable given that trainings were offered prior to each section needing to be submitted.
* Suggestion: I feel like admin. should be doing/making suggestions about, then we have some conversations/written narrative about overall goals, etc., which IS important.

Process was reasonable and provided departments with easy access to various information (Q10)

* Data challenge on student services area
* More training on Tableau, training is valuable
* Information is in too many places
* The data was spoon feed to us so it was often plugin ready
* PIE office was hands on in gathering data we needed, incredibly helpful. The “how-to” navigate power point is helpful.

Program review training were helpful (Q11)

* The gathering of the information from the web based tool was clunky and didn't really make much sense. It was hard to navigate and get a hang of. Training should be focused on specific usage not vague explorations.
* PIE were very helpful and provided plenty of "hands-on" work time.
* My department colleague who did said they were useful

Feedback from your supervisor was helpful (Q12)

* Guidance on data for success visioning from Nancy was Helpful. There wasn't a place for New Goals in the document. The resource request part, maybe have that due sooner so we could get feedback and resubmit.
* My Dean made a checklist that was thoughtful and helpful.

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
* See how our work impacting our students or employees
* 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
* Its strength lies in its ability to track future and current plans of the department. It refocuses the department on its goals.

Greatest drawback to program review and recommended changes (Q14) and Lesson learned or takeaway (Q15)

* Program Review Process
  + What does the Program Review do? Who reviews it? This is not an accountability question. Genuinely, I do not know who else, besides my dean, looks at what has been revealed and discussed in the Program Review. This lack of transparency honestly makes me (and others) less motivated to put much thought into the Program Review.
  + Don't know the solution yet. 1. Make a program review a dynamic process instead of a "dead" document. We can update the program review anytime we want. 2. Enable the program review process to allow programs to collaborate.
  + We need to stop modifying the templates.
* Finding time to work with faculty in my department. Many did not have a voice in the process this year.
* 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.
* Keep up the great work around program review. Find a way to engage more of LMC in the process.
* I appreciate the support, professional development, and timeline from the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.
* 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 "chunkin" 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.
  + Using Department Chair meetings to work together on Program Review was very helpful! Please continue this in the future.
* 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". We have a huge weight on our shoulders in respect to education and the future of automation, we can not run business as usual, we need to focus on what will market education as "future proof".
* 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.
  + 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.
* 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 SWAT approach?
* I would like more college wide final publication (not dept. level) 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.
* In Student Services I came to the realization of how much we can improve as it pertains to developing a more cohesive work group. Under new leadership we have been engage in important conversations that are leading us towards the development of a more cohesive student centered approach.