

Program Review Annual Summary
Fall 2017
Prepared by the Program Review Committee

Program Review Members:

Chairs: Emmanuel (Manny) Mourtzanos, Dean of Instruction, Fine & Performing Arts, Admin Co-Chair; Kimberly Nickell, ACDV, Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin Rabe, Media Services, Classified Co-Chair

Members:

Faculty Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker, Philosophy; Brenda Nyagwachi, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; Heather Baltis, Agriculture; David Neville, Foreign Language; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Brian Sivesind, Theater; Lillian Pimentel-Stratton, FACE; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Hibba Ashraf, Biology; Nicole Hernandez, Nursing; Savanna Andrasian, English; Jennifer Johnson, Nursing (Curriculum Liason); Diane Allen, Counseling; Administrators:Sue Vaughn, Child Development Center; Classified Meg Stidham, CSEA designee
Antonio Alfaro, CTE
Student
SGA Genae Romo
Ex-Officio

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 109 (of 112) programs PRC reviewed, which included:
 - 10 Admin Units- all Annual Updates
 - 13 Student Affairs-1 Comp (Counseling) 12 Annual Updates
 - 13 of 14 Academic Affairs-All Annual Updates
 - 11 of 12 Other Areas-1 Comp (English for Multicultural Learners) 10 Annual Updates
 - 1 Baccalaureate-Annual Update
 - 61 of 62 Instructional-16 of which were Comprehensive Reviews and 45 Annual Updates.
- 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, Curriculum, and Professional Development committees; FCDC; College Council; CTE; and the College President in the resource allocation process.
 - Budget Requests = 25
 - Classified Position Requests = 43

- Faculty Position Requests = 52
- Facilities Requests = 100
- ISIT Tech Requests = 95
- Other Equip Requests = 52
- Professional Development Requests = 31
- Certificates Reported = 12
- CTE Reported = 30
- Curricular Reviews Reported = 23
- Assessments – 81 areas submitted

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 2017 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.

- We created a single naming convention for all documents. Each dean/chair received his or her own thumb drive with their forms.
 - This helped in getting a larger number of correct forms back, which was something we struggled with in past years.
- Increase in overall annual update submissions (98%). This is due in part to the inclusion of more programs in the process (112 in all).
- List of programs was more conclusive this year. In turn, we had more programs complete program reviews.
- Assessment Form was restructured from last year. While the form was better received, there appears to be a need to create assessment forms that better reflects admin units and non-instructional programs.
- With the implementation of eLumen, PRC will be ready with the process and forms for a smooth transition.
- Equity Question still left unanswered or answers did not reflect the question.
- With the change of leadership in the budget management, there was some confusion about who would receive the budget form. For the most part, we were able to clarify that the deans were responsible for submitting budget.
- Some departments had difficulty understanding the need to do a program review for all AA, AS, AST, and certificates.

Outcomes based on the process:

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

- We look forward to an electronic process for program review. The adoption of the software program eLumen will facilitate the Program Review process more effectively: no confusion about forms, it will be linked to Assessment and Curriculum, and it will be housed in one location.
- The Program Review Committee has become a strong repository of evidence that can be accessed for accreditation purposes.
- Our systems are better integrated. We work more effectively with other committees...we are breaking out of our silos.
- Campus culture has shifted
 - Many of the faculty and staff are changing their perspectives on program review, regarding the process as an opportunity to promote educational excellence and improve instruction and services to students.
 - The resource acquisition process and budgeting process is more fully understood and integrated.
 - There is a better understanding among faculty and staff the implications of the program review process and its important role in accreditation. This has been vocalized within committee meetings across campus.

Findings for the 2017 cycle:

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ While we sent out packets with accurate forms with specific naming conventions, PRC continued receiving outdated forms; however, there were fewer than previous cycles.
- ✓ Some programs took immediate advantage of feedback and resubmitted their program reviews
- ✓ AUs submitted without any forms
- ✓ Some received resources were assessed, not all. We struggled with the section on resource assessment overall. We are looking to revamp this for the next cycle.
- ✓ Some programs had spoken to resource and staffing needs within the AU or Comprehensive without submitting appropriate forms or submitted forms without justification.
- ✓ Received resources were not assessed
- ✓ Equity question was not answered or not effectively addressed.
- ✓ There was confusion or lack of communication within programs/deans/chairs as to who submits budget form.
- ✓ Conclusions were better drafted.
- ✓ Missing mission statements

- ✓ Programs didn't understand that they had program learning outcomes or administrative outcomes.
- ✓ Trend data not used. Trend data not broken out for individual programs, i.e. Business Administration
- ✓ Requests...one form to include previous requests, new requests
- ✓ Some "Other" equipment requests were distributed to Facilities and ISIT requests – they were submitted incorrectly
- ✓ 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.
- ✓ Sue Vaughn gave an example of keeping the goals and needed resources ongoing, even if it is 15 years.
- ✓ 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
- ✓ Budget form issues. Only deans received them, and it seemed to cause confusion with some chairs. This may be resolved next year if we keep the format that they will go to the deans again. This is to spark conversations between deans and dept. chairs.
- ✓ Equity piece is still a conundrum. Maybe meet with Equity and Inclusion and figure out what we need to ask and what we are looking for in the answers. Do we include it as a box within the goal section? Still need to speak to it in the trend data. Be sensitive to the issues of disproportionate impact.
- ✓ Put the conclusion at the beginning as an abstract.
- ✓ Welcome to your Program Review Packet letter with hard and fast deadlines. Some may think forms are optional.
- ✓ The Handbook may be too much information
- ✓ Bullets within the assessment form made it confusing and difficult to enter dialog.
- ✓ How did some people not have unexpected things crop up in Program Analysis?
- ✓ Encourage to answer NA when it isn't relevant.
- ✓ Categorical budget programs don't have to submit HR form for staffing

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. Streamline the handbook. Create better prompts and examples within handbook to help with the forms.
3. Meet with department chairs and deans (FCDC) to clarify budget request responsibilities. Provide an informal training at that time, with timelines in place.
4. Facilities Requests: programs had a better understanding of the process and the difference between a work order and a request PRC will provide examples of request types within handbook. Encourage programs to become familiar with the M&O Work Orders.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Because the conclusion can be an opportunity to spotlight the program, changing it to an abstract at the beginning of the form could strengthen its purpose and help programs refine this section.
8. 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.
9. The equity question still stumps some programs, and the Assessment Committee is having questions about this. Maybe take that off the assessment piece and pull that back into the AU and Comp. forms. Develop the Equity question to be more relevant. Maybe introduce with philosophical aspect. Give an example of a problem to help with the connection.
10. PRC chairs have already met with a representative of the assessment committee and have better direction leading into the Spring Semester of where we need to be on our assessment form.
11. Administrative units are refining (based on feedback and further direction from the Institution) their assessments with their Administrative Unit Outcomes. They are resubmitting them to the Program Review Committee for inclusion with their packet as of 12/5.

12. Overall, we want to work together to be transparent, make this right and steer ourselves into a positive direction that will ultimately benefit future generations to come at Bakersfield College.

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 tailored Assessment Forms for admin and other non-instructional units.
5. Buy in, outreach, training, constituencies will continue.
6. Defend the process.
7. Maintain 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 abstract.
14. Engage initiatives to participate in the program review process.
15. Strive to ensure that direct correlation between the Budget Request Form and the Budget Request Process exists.
16. Send budget form to directors instead of VP.
17. Hold a college-wide dialog about scheduling facilities for meetings, workshops, and events.
18. Develop a policy on consequences for programs that do not complete the Program Review Process.
19. Continue to find the most effective method of providing a document packet for each area which includes the most recent version of forms until an online process becomes available.
20. Provide a report to the President and VP regarding areas that did not submit a program review.
21. Reach out to College Council how to address the issue of areas who have not turned in their program reviews.
22. For AU/CR that are missing forms: send one email to Nan to send to FCDC, SS, and Admin SVC. The email will acknowledge receipt of the program review and request the missing forms (specifically best practices, faculty position request, classified position request, technology, and facilities).

23. Next year before program review is due, verify program title for each department. Include verification of programs that are not offered.
24. Update handbook to provide relevant examples and directions.
25. 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.
26. Will generate a survey to provide data for the closing the loop document.
27. Work with the Assessment Committee on the Assessment Form. The goal is to better understand what the Assessment Committee needs. Develop an Assessment Form that serves non-instructional units.

Three-year Summary Report Trend:

- Over the past three Program Review cycles 2015-17, the number of programs included in the Program Review process has increased:
 - 2015 98 programs-85 submissions
 - 2016 107 programs-104 submissions
 - 2017 113 programs-110 submissions

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

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 be more streamlined and relevant, 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 continues to grow and strengthen. The perception of Program Review is at an all-time high. This was evident at the November 6, 2017 Standard III Accreditation Forum, as well as the dialog about the importance of program review at governance committee meetings. While so much has been accomplished this 2017 cycle, the Program Review process can always be improved. The committee will

strengthen its commitment to affect change of Program Review and to strengthen connections across the BC campus with other committees. We will work to set and achieve 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.

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