PROGRAM REVIEW SURVEY SPRING 2014

SUMMARY REPORT

1.) Did you participate in the Program Review Process in Spring 2014?

Yes: 37 responses (82%) No: 8 responses (18%)

**45 total responses, 100% of submissions*

2.) If you did not participate in the Program Review process, why not: *(check all that apply)*

a. Were you not aware of Program Review?: 3 responses (43%)
b. Were you not encouraged or invited to participate?: 4 responses (57%)
c. Did you choose not to participate?: 1 response (14%)

**7 total responses, 16% of submissions*

d. Other (please specify): 2 responses (4%)

- The PRST did not work for me. I emailed Eng many times, but nothing he told me helped. I could not get the Assessment tab to work. We think that my assessment data may have been in another disciplines' assessment tab.
- Done by manager

**2 total responses, 4% of submissions*

3.) If you participated in the Program Review process, how did you participate: *(check all that apply)*

a. In setting new objectives: 33 responses (94%)
b. In reviewing progress of old objectives: 31 responses (89%)
c. In department/unit/program discussions about the Program Review: 30 responses (86%)

**35 total responses, 78% of submissions*

d. Other (please specify): 3 responses (7%)

- RAP and Perkins
- Uploading Assessments
- Providing assistance to other department members in using the Web app

**3 total responses, 7% of submissions*

4.) Did you find the Program Review Submission Tool easier to use this year?

Yes: 22 responses (56%) No: 8 responses (21%) N/A: 9 responses (23%)

**39 total responses, 87% of submissions*

4a.) What did you like about the Program Review Submission Tool?

- The ability to access information from previous years and to keep track of department information. *(4 responses)*
- The ability to edit and insert word documents. *(2 responses)*
- The layout and I also liked the helpful tips and information, it made it easier to complete the Program Review. *(7 responses)*
- Easier to access from off campus *(2 responses)*
- It was easier to get to than last year *(3 responses)*
- Limited in functional buttons for my department
- There was an ease of access to data relevant to completing the review.
- Too early to evaluate, it appears to have had the suggestions from the previous 2 year's suggestions. What we really need is to commit to a format and stay with it until the next accreditation process.
- It kept running.
- PRST did not work for me. My data folder for 2014-2015 was empty. When I clicked the Assessment tab, nothing happened. More but 150 character limit.
- We had some data to work with BUT obtaining data was DIFFICULT

**24 total responses, 53% of submissions*

4b.) What suggestions do you have to improve the tool?

- Please add an always accessible "year Independent" data repository so units can keep all their important documents -- like department guidelines, job descriptions, etc. -- in one place so they don't get lost when personnel transitions occur. *(2 responses)*
- Let us edit current/new objectives. If we wanted to edit, we had to DELETE and start over. *(3 responses)*
- There should be a LINK from the NEW OBJECTIVES to the RAP proposals. Without attending the department chair meeting(s) and the workshop, we would NOT have been able to work through the Program Review process --- could it be simplified? *(2 responses)*
- It was unclear what was to be done on the Data Repository page. Further directions about how to use the contents would be very helpful. SQL data should be accessible from off-campus. *(2 responses)*
- Make the character limits suggestions rather than actual limits. Allow styled text (at least bold, italics, and bullet points) *(2 responses)*
- The data needs someone beyond the department/program to filter what is useful for each area. I recommend a dean or manager to decipher relative data and work with the chairs on how this relates to their program. I'm not sure how I feel about the flower. (maybe Eloine/John could redesign the splash page?)
- No place to connect re: collaborations. If someone in another area mentioned using my dept. to accomplish part of their work, I wouldn't know. Suggest some sort of dropdown check box set up that messages the mentioned department to let them know that the other department is mentioning you in their program review. No accountability built into this. I could mention many things my supervisor would never want us to focus on.
- Allow chairs to check off completion of COORs rewrites
- This is more a suggestion for the process, but it will need to be integrated into the tool. It would be useful if we could assign a lead and provide status updates at both the objective and activity levels.

- Continue to add more tips within the tool itself. That is very helpful.
- Allow the process to remain the same for at least 3 years. Thanks.
- Use correct assessment dates. Do not list Astronomy courses in Physics/Engineering courses. Do not make Faculty do Administrative and Secretarial work. All assessment reports were previously submitted,
- Difficulty entering names into fields.
- It needs the ability to log out
- Functionality across different platforms (IE, firefox, chrome, etc)

**21 total responses, 47% of submissions*

5.) Did you find the Guide to Program Review easy to use?

Yes: 17 responses(40%) No: 7 responses(17%) N/A: 18 responses (43%)

**42 total responses, 93% of submissions*

5a.) What did you like about the Guide?

- Clear and 'step-by-step'. *(9 responses)*
- I must have seen the guide, but I do not recall it and can't now lay my hands on it, so without an identifying visual here I cannot comment. *(4 responses)*
- Too long, helpful for detailed people, but a quick "BOLD' lettering of step 1 2 3... and or pictures is desired but not necessary.
- There may have been info about uploading files that I could not see or understand in the guide. They should just have us do a Word document like last year.
- I still think a lot of the data analysis should be done by deans, it's disjointed and very hard to understand/translate. I'm not against data, but deans need to take an active role in interpreting the data and in writing these reports.
- I never figured out what the CORE figures meant. There should be explanation of all documents.

**17 total responses, 38% of submissions*

5b.) What suggestions do you have to improve the Guide?

- Include a little more about course assessments. Someone who is new to Program Review and completing it may not know how to access the course assessments and/or what to do with them in regards to Program Review. *(2 responses)*
- When it takes LONGER to read through the guide than it does to complete the Program Review, doesn't the process need simplification?!? *(3 responses)*
- None *(2 responses)*
- Everything should just be on Word documents. The online PRST did not work. Tabs did not work. I had to say this here because of the 150 character limit.
- Deans should meet with departments to discuss data, generate ideas and strategies. Changing the format each year is making it worse as faculty has to re-learn the process each time and this is very frustrating.
- Allow users to click into definitions or explanations of data
- More guidance about how to use and interpret the SQL and Core Indicators data would be helpful
- Do not leave out an entire section (program benchmarks) next time.

**12 total responses,*

6.) Did you find the Guide to SQL data easy to use?

Yes: 11 responses (27%) No: 6 responses (15%) N/A: 24 responses (59%)

6a.) What did you like about the Guide?

- But, I did attend a workshop and was walked through the process at a CTE meeting. As a hands-on learner, that worked better for me. *(4 responses)*
- The steps outlined gave a sequence that could be used as a checklist. Easy to use. It would have been hopeless to retrieve data otherwise. *(4 responses)*
- What guide? Never saw this guide, it would have been helpful, where it is located? *(2 responses)*
- It doesn't matter since the technology did not work for me. Nothing that Eng emailed me helped. He couldn't solve my problems with the PRST.
- I didn't need help so did not use the guide. I just glanced at it and notice the screen shots are used there.

**12 total responses, 27% of submissions*

6b.) What suggestions do you have to improve the Guide?

- None *(2 responses)*
- This area needs hand holding, not every department is keen on SQL data and how it related to making global directives in their respective departments.
- Too many steps, data interpretation and report writing should be more of an administrator duty, and then consult with departments to come to agreement about directions.
- All access of SQL data from off campus computers. Allow more than 300 character responses in these boxes.
- Tell us that we also have a pdf option for printing the results.

**6 total responses, 13% of submissions*

7.) In order to make the SQL data more robust for next year's Program Review, what additional data would you like next year? Please be as specific as possible.

- Cut data on student success, retention, persistence by college level in English to help determine whether we need to consider improvements to course pedagogy and/or provide support services. *(2 responses)*
- An easy way to show the college data for the questions asked so that we could easily compare our unit data with the college data *(3 responses)*
- Transfer rates per department! Or at least for Physics and Engineering transfers. This will be used for program benchmarks *(4 responses)*
- I would like the district to site innovative departments that support curriculum development that supports "Equity and Diversity". I believe all instructional programs should in some regard support this strategic goals. *(2 responses)*
- Show data on how many students actually become eligible for certificates as compared to how many are completing each semester. There is lag time between completion of course work and if/when a student applies for a locally approved certificate in our department. *(3 responses)*
- We need to have the district stand up to the state in regards to funding tied with completion degrees/certs

- This is exactly the kind of thing that deans are hired to do and think about. I trust my dean to look at this and give guidance, and that is the kind of leadership we need, not a huge pile of paperwork and verbiage containing conflicting agendas into a patched-together, disjointed process
- N/A

**17 total responses, 38% of submissions*

7a.) Was the training adequate?

Yes: 19 responses (48%) No: 5 responses (13%) N/A: 16 responses (40%)

**40 total responses, 89% of submissions*

7b.) Would you have liked more training dates?

Yes: 10 responses (24%) No: 20 responses (49%) N/A: 11 responses (27%)

**41 total responses, 91% of submissions*

7c.) Would you have liked more hands-on training?

Yes: 17 responses (43%) No: 11 responses (28%) N/A: 12 responses (30%)

**40 total responses, 89% of submissions*

7d.) Did the workshops provide necessary information?

Yes: 17 responses (43%) No: 3 responses (8%) N/A: 20 responses (50%)

**40 total responses, 89% of submissions*

7e.) What suggestions do you have for future training?

- More hands-on training in computer labs. Offer a few different sessions throughout the year not only when Program Review is "open" or due. *(4 responses)*
- Maybe more one on one conference meetings rather than more workshops *(2 responses)*
- Offer them at times when I don't have classes or hiring interviews.
- Deans/administrators need to be doing more of this work, Faculty are here to teach
- Just have us do it in a supervised environment.
- Adequate training was made available.
- I didn't attend any workshops.
- More advice/training on how to compose, complete the material in Program Review as opposed to how to use the application
- Properly advertised.

**13 total responses, 29% of submissions*

8.) Did the timeline to complete the Program Review this year work for you?

Yes: 24 responses (59%) No: 9 responses (22%) N/A: 8 responses (20%)

**41 total responses, 91% of submissions*

8a.) If not, what suggestions do you have for next year?

- Better integration with RAP. *(6 responses)*
- The original due date was challenging because it was due 1 day after a 4 day holiday weekend, The timeline extension that was given by president Bob was very helpful. Thanks. *(3 responses)*
- I would like to plan Spring flex around this for our department, to get it done earlier in the semester, perhaps even before classes start. *(2 responses)*
- I consider our "off-months", if there really are any, the months of March/April and October/November. These would be a better choice.
- The week of finals.
- On its own, program review times were OK. But in the context of everything else, it was due at the worst possible time.

**14 total responses, 31% of submissions*