

Program Review Summary Report 2019-20

Prepared for Academic Senate by the Program Review Committee

Program Review Members:

Chairs: Stephen Waller, Dean of Instruction; Kimberly Nickell, ACDV, Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin Rabe, Media Services, Classified Co-Chair

Members: Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker-Collins, Philosophy; Anna Melby, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; LeAnn Riley, Agriculture; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Nicole Hernandez, Nursing; Keri Wolf, English; Jennifer Johnson, Nursing (Curriculum Liaison); Scott Dameron, Health & PE; Klint Rigby, Engineering; Jason Dixon, Industrial Technology; Katie Ganster, Biology; Brent Wilson, Assessment Liaison; Linda McLaughlin, Foreign Language; Gabriel Searcy, Psychology; Aneesha Awrey, Counseling; Casandra Goodman, Athletics; F. Javier Llamas, Social Sciences; Maurice Muller-Quinhoneiro, adj. Chemistry

Admin and Managers: Amber Hroch, OIE

Kalina Hill, TAPC

Classified: Meg Stidham, CSEA designee

SGA: David Wayne Collins II, SGA Senator 2

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:

- Annual Updates Instruction 58 out of 60
- Annual Updates Non-Instruction 27 out of a possible 45 = includes, Administrative, Student and Academic Affairs areas.
- Total 85 out of 105 possible.
- 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, and Curriculum committees; FCDC; College Council; CTE; and the College President in the resource allocation process:
 - Classified Position Requests = 57
 - Faculty Position Requests = 63
 - Facilities Requests = 93 (about 5 work orders)

- ISIT Tech Requests = 105
- Other Equip Requests = 31
- Budget Development Forms Completed = 18

Summary Report Trend:

- The number of programs included in the Program Review process has increased:
 - 2016 107 programs-104 submissions
 - 2017 113 programs-110 submissions
 - 2018 119 programs-103 submissions
 - 2019 105 programs-85 submissions

Observations

Program Review as an Agent for Change

- Opportunity to promote educational excellence.
- Improve instruction and services to students.
- Integrated system between committees and initiatives.
- Program review feedback is a team effort and allows for meaningful improvement in the process.
- eLumen to create an accessible and meaningful program review process.
- Accreditation
 - The correlation between Program Review, resource requests, and budgeting
 - Strategic Directions
 - Closing the loop
 - Vision for Success

Changes to the 2019 Cycle:

- The Annual Update was fully in eLumen
- Program Review was available in spring (instructional) and early summer (non-instructional)
- List of programs was more conclusive this year in eLumen
- PRC created both non-instructional and instructional program reviews which were more relevant to the program types.
- KCCD Data in Tableau

- Administrative Unit Outcomes were aligned with Institutional Learning Outcomes.
- CCCC Vision for Success was incorporated in the AU.
- District services

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 2019 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.

- ✓ Some were hesitant to attempt work in eLumen
- ✓ Some program reviews were brief, without meaningful analysis.
- ✓ Needs, challenges were not clear.
 - If it's not memorable, or if appropriate committees don't have a clear understanding of what a program's needs are, it's not going to be high on priority list.
- ✓ What to do with data, disproportionate impact and equity.
- ✓ While we saw well-developed goals, some goals are still reading as resource requests.
 - Goals should be student or campus centered, not resource centered.
 - Resources should either tie to a goal or show justification
- ✓ Received resources were not assessed
- ✓ Some programs used feedback from last year.
- ✓ Conclusions were better drafted, but some were left blank.
- ✓ New Tableau trend data not used effectively to analyze programs.
- ✓ AUOs were better developed and were aligned to the institutional outcomes.

Outcomes based on the process:

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

- We look forward to an even better program review process in 2020 as we have learned so much about eLumen
- The Program Review Committee has become a strong repository of evidence that can be accessed for accreditation purposes.
- Our systems are well integrated. We work effectively with other committees (Assessment, Curriculum, and Budget).
- Campus culture continues to shift positively
 - As faculty and staff change their perspectives on program review, regarding the process as an opportunity to promote educational excellence and improve instruction and services to students, they are affecting change within their programs and across campus.
 - The resource acquisition process and budgeting process is more fully understood and integrated.
 - The resources allocation/prioritization process has become more transparent.
 - There is a better understanding among faculty and staff of the implications of the program review process and its important role in accreditation. This has been vocalized within committee meetings across campus.
- Data
 - Steve Waller initiated the development of additional data with Amber Hroch through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to provide more effective and accessible data
 - KCCD IRB Program Review data is in Tableau

Opportunities:

The Program Review Committee considers the following as opportunities for the next cycle:

1. Clarify the importance of assessing resources received from previous cycle and the impact on the program.
2. Create the 3-year Comprehensive in eLumen.

3. Facilities Requests: programs had a better understanding of the process and the difference between a work order and a request.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Give program/department specific workshops in the spring to navigate through eLumen
8. Identify new programs to give relevant and constructive feedback

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 workshops to help admin units develop strong AUOs
4. Data workshops
5. Buy in, outreach, training, constituencies will continue.
6. Continue work toward compliance with ACCJC standards
7. Always looking to improve efficiency of the process through feedback, surveys, self-reflection to support a successful institution and student success.
8. 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 to create relevant AUs
9. Provide more training for administrators, current and incoming department chairs, and interested employees.

10. Provide examples of effective program review elements.
11. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were a summary.
12. Engage initiatives to participate in the program review process.
13. Verify program title for each department in eLumen. Include verification of programs that are not offered.
14. Verify roles of end users and the programs with which they are associated
15. Provide example sections of program reviews.
16. Create a rubric to guide end users and PRC members
17. 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.
18. Look at the Education Masterplan along with the Facilities Masterplan to determine space allocation requests
19. Follow the example that ASCCC suggests to create a program review that ties in with Guided Pathways and Student Support Services
20. Work with Equity and Inclusion to refine question for more relevancy and clarity.
21. Incorporate Program Mapper

What's new for the 2020-21 Cycle?

- The 2020-21 cycle has been rolled out in eLumen. PRC reached out to all chairs, deans, directors, and VPs through email. This is the earliest roll out to date.
- Created the 3-year Comprehensive
- Created program specific program reviews
 - Instructional
 - Non instructional
 - Hybrid
- Student Equity and Success piece retooled
- Refined questions for relevancy
- Reformatted Goals section
- Updated Assessment in collaboration with the Assessment committee
- Incorporated Program Mapper with collaboration with OIE and Curriculum
- Resource requests are their own initiatives

- We have reformatted eLumen feedback sections for easier access and reporting out

Conclusion:

The Program Review process continues to evolve, and its contributions to the resource allocation, the accreditation processes, and ultimately student success continue to grow and strengthen. The perception of Program Review is at an all-time high, and this is evident through the dialog about the importance of program review at governance committee meetings.

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 as we learn more about eLumen, we can refine the program review forms and the process so that it will be streamlined, relevant, and easily accessible, with language that engages editors in thoughtful dialogue. As well, we will be working closely with the Assessment, Curriculum, and Budget Committees as well as CTE, Equity and Inclusion, and OIE to ensure that the program review process is effectively cohesive.

The Program Review Committee received praise from the ACCJC visiting team in fall 2018, and from this, the co-chairs of Program Review were invited to share our practices with others through the ACCJC Partners in Excellence Conference in April 2019 and the eLumenation conference in May of 2019.

PRC is committed to be an agent of change. We have strengthened connections across the BC campus with other committees. We have set and achieved goals to create an effective Program Review process, be fully in eLumen, and to complete the highest quality of work to meet the stringent standards of ACCJC, and the accreditation process. We hope that our work leads to 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.

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

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