



# **Analysis and Recommendations of Cañada College's Program Review Assessment Efforts**

**From Assessment Advisory Group**

**To Planning and Budgeting Council**

**September 2015**



## ASSESSMENT ADVISORY GROUP (AAG) MEMBERS INCLUDE

- Dani Behonick (Curriculum chair, Faculty, IPC, Standard IIA)
- Doug Hirzel (PBC co-chair, Faculty, Standard IIA and all Standards)
- Jessica Kaven (IPC co-chair, Faculty, Standard IIA)
- Jeanne Stalker (Classified, Standard IIC)
- David Johnson (Dean, Standard IIA)
- Kim Lopez (Student Services, SSPC co-chair, Standard IIC)
- Michelle Marquez (APC, Standard I, Standard III)
- Anniqa Rana (Learning Support, Standard IIB)
- Chialin Hsieh (ALO, APC chair, all Standards)

## TASK FOR THE ASSESSMENT ADVISORY GROUP

- Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of THE college's assessment effort and provide recommendations to PBC on September 2, 2015.
- ILO Report to PBC on September 16, 2015.
- Ensure that Cañada meets ACCJC standards with regards to Student Learning Outcomes and provide recommendations to PBC on October 21, 2015.
- Update/Evaluate Assessment Manual and provide recommendations to PBC on November 18, 2015.
- Complete/Update ACCJC Annual Report and provide recommendations to PBC on March 16, 2016.

## ANALYSIS OF THE COLLEGE'S ASSESSMENT EFFORTS

**What is the process of program review in each planning council? (How have program reviews been shared and evaluated. How has feedback been provided?)**

---

### INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

Under the "Old System" (before 2014-2015 academic year), each department/discipline/program completed an Annual Program Plans every year and a Comprehensive Program Review every six years. At the time of the Comprehensive Program Review, programs would give a presentation highlighting their program; the venue for this presentation was the penultimate Curriculum Committee meeting of each academic year. Programs would also receive feedback on their Comprehensive Reviews. Prior to the 2013-2014 academic year this feedback was provided by the Curriculum Committee; henceforth, this feedback was provided by IPC with additional faculty and staff volunteers.

Prior to the 2014-2015 academic year, curriculum review (updating of active courses and programs) was integrated into Program Review; that is, faculty were expected to ensure that course and program outlines in their discipline were up-to-date during the Program Review Self-Study process. In the months leading to accreditation it became clear that this process could be improved with regard to ensuring compliance. Curriculum review is now separate from Program Review and falls under purview of the Curriculum Committee.

A new Program Review process for Instructional Programs was developed by the Academic Senate and approved during 2013-2014 academic year; the 2014-2015 academic year was its first year in use. Instructional programs now complete Resource Requests every year and Instructional Program Plans (similar to the old Annual Program Plan) every other year. Disciplines in the Business, Design and Workforce Division, Science and Technology division, Honors Transfer Program and College for Working Adults submit Instructional Program Plans in odd-numbered years while disciplines in the Athletics, Kinesiology, Dance, Library and Learning Center and Humanities and Social Science divisions submit Instructional Program Plans in even-numbered years. Programs are required to give a presentation every 6 years according to a rotating schedule. During the 2014-2015 academic year these presentations were given at the second-to-last Curriculum Committee meeting; the Curriculum Committee has since voted to stop coordinating these presentations as they are no longer responsible for any part of the Program Review process. Feedback on Instructional Program Plan documents is provided by IPC. IPC will organize presentations to the college community.

Instructional Program Plan documents submitted during the 2014-2015 academic year were reviewed by IPC at the March 6<sup>th</sup> and March 20<sup>th</sup> meetings. Groups of about four individuals (IPC members and outside faculty/staff volunteers) were each assigned to review and provide feedback on five to six Instructional Program Plans from both of the divisions who submitted reviews this academic year (Business, Design and Workforce and Science and Technology) using the feedback form approved by IPC earlier in the academic year. This feedback was then distributed to discipline faculty in April.

#### Learning Outcomes:

Programs receive TracDat reports on Learning Outcomes and based on the level of each program's engagement with the assessment process this information is incorporated into program planning.

---

## STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

In the Student Services Division, every department belongs to one of eleven program review teams. Each program review team submits a comprehensive program review document every other year. Resource requests are submitted by each team every year. Program Review documents are submitted to the Student Services Planning Council (SSPC) every year by the end of February. Members of the SSPC review the documents and provide comments via feedback forms to each team. All eleven teams annually develop, measure and reflect upon student learning outcomes data to inform practices. The program review teams input student learning outcome data into TracDat where it can be analyzed and our progress/challenges documented.

---

## ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

There are five administrative services areas—instruction, student services, administrative services, PRIE, and public relations/communications. Each area submits a program review document every other year. Resource requests are submitted by each team every year. Program Review documents are submitted to the Administrative Planning Council (APC) every year by the end of February. SAO data and analysis are included in the program review form and not entered into TracDat. Members present their program review at APC meeting in March and/or April. APC provides verbal feedback to the member on program review as well as resources requests. Questions and comments can be addressed by presenters during the APC meeting. There is no feedback form from APC.

---

## RESOURCES REQUESTS FEEDBACK

Departments/programs submit their resource requests in program review for the following areas:

- Instructional equipment,
- Supplies,
- Technology,
- Facilities,
- Professional development.

Requests are reviewed or ‘vetted’ by the appropriate administrator (Dean, VP). Resource requests are included in the program review evaluation process and then all requests are sent to the VPAS. The VPAS compiles the requests into two broad categories: (1) Instructional equipment and supplies, and (2) Information Technology. The table below outlines the timeline and process for the resource request process:

The responsible party for the Program Review Resource Requests	May	June	July
<b>Instruction: Instructional equipment—VPI and iDeans</b>	Deans and VPs review and prioritize the list using the Check List	Submit the list to VPAS.	VPAS notifies Deans and VPs for the funding availability
<b>Student Services: Non- and instructional equipment—VPSS and Dean of Counseling</b>			
<b>Administrative: Non instructional equipment--e-Team</b>			
<b>Information Technology—Dean of BDW (Tech Committee chair)</b>	Tech Committee Task Force reviews each program	Submit the list to VPAS.	Tech Committee Task Force notifies each program
<b>Facilities—VPAS</b>	VPAS reviews each program		VPAS notifies each program
<b>Research—PRIE</b>	PRIE reviews each program		PRIE notifies each program
<b>Professional Development—VPAS (PD Advisory Group chair)</b>	VPAS reviews each program		VPAS notifies each program

## Identify the strengths and challenges of each areas' assessment efforts

### Strengths:

---

#### INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- Inclusion of faculty/staff from outside IPC in IPP evaluation/feedback process
- Standardized feedback document that is aligned with IPP self-study document

---

#### STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- All program review teams present their PR during a scheduled SSPC meeting each April-May.
- All SSPC members in attendance complete a feedback form that includes evaluation on the following: SLO's, SAO's, faculty and staff hiring requests, Professional Development Needs, Equipment and Facilities requests.
- Feedback forms are collected and attached to the meeting minutes.

---

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- All program review teams present their PR item by item during a scheduled APC meeting each March/April.
- All APC members in attendance provide verbal feedback including resource requests to the presenter. Questions or comments can be addressed by the presenters during the APC meeting.
- The complete program review reports are posted at the website before the APC meeting and members are encouraged to review them before the presentation.

---

#### RESOURCE REQUEST

- Resource requests are submitted in a timely manner.
- There is a process for the different types of resource requests.
- The various departments and programs know the process for submitting requests.

### Challenges:

---

#### INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- The rubric used by IPC to give feedback on the IPP should be made available to faculty *before* they write their PR.
- Inconsistent use of feedback form by reviewers.
- The rubric provides feedback on an item-by-item level of attention but does not include an overall assessment of the program. Feedback needs to include whether/how to improve the IPP but, more importantly, what aspects of the program need improvement.
- Some reviewers do not feel conversant enough to offer constructive criticism or do not see it as their responsibility. They feel that they aren't the discipline expert.
- There is currently no place for deans to provide their feedback regarding program vitality – strengths/challenges.

- Faculty receive feedback on IPP documents from IPC and then do not have an opportunity to address/respond to that feedback as current process stands
- Feedback form does not provide AAG with a way to easily identify possible evidence for accreditation – especially examples of SLO/PLO impact.
- Lack of coordination between ASGC/IPC/Curriculum Committee in designing schedule for Program Review and schedule for Curriculum Review/Update - this is especially burdensome for some CTE program faculty, who must review/update curriculum every two years and are more likely to be responsible for Program Review at the same time

---

#### STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- Feedback forms are completed after the presentations are provided at a SSPC meeting; often members do not read the entire Program Review submitted. They only evaluate the PR from the presentation provided in a SSPC meeting.
- SSPC members may not know enough about assessment measures to effectively evaluate the data collection and evaluation measures used for the SLO and SAO aspects of the Program Reviews.
- We need to be more effective at ensuring that the program review teams review the feedback forms provided by the SSPC members.
- Feedback form does not provide AAG with a way to easily identify possible evidence for accreditation – especially examples of SLO/SAO impact.

---

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM REVIEW ASSESSMENT

- No feedback form was used; therefore, presenter has to take their own notes for the feedback or rely on APC minutes.
- APC members may not know enough about assessment measures to effectively evaluate the data collection and evaluation measures used for the SAO aspects of the Program Reviews.

---

#### RESOURCE REQUEST

- No feedback, vetting, or prioritization provided by administrators
- Funding is not allocated until late July or early August (sometimes can be as late as October), and July/August are a challenging time to make these determinations.
- There is a great deal of inconsistencies in what type of resource requests are submitted
- We need to clarify/refine our allocation and prioritization plan/process.

## DISCUSSION SUMMARY

### Cultural shift in assessment

- The focus on assessment should begin early and be reviewed for clarity
- We need to communicate and provide more training to make PBC and Division meetings more effective.
- We need to assess PR like we assess students in the classroom setting – ask tough questions and give constructive criticism so that they can improve
- ⊖ The Data Dashboard and other internal sources are providing programs with additional data that are being used in PR.
- When is PIV initiated? How does it connect to PR? We need to reduce anxiety about PIV and PR so that we focus on them as mechanisms for supporting and improving program vitality
- How do we evaluate program resource requests needs and relate them to assessment? How do learning outcomes relate to planning?

### Rubrics and feedback form

- Rubrics needed for APC and SSPC
- SPOL will provide alternative methods for providing feedback.
- Identify how programs can be strengthened
- Identify Pros/Cons –Commendations/Recommendations (Ensure constructive feedback)
- Need training for providing feedback

### Coordinate PCs

- Planning committees need to improve/refine process of sharing feedback with PBC to inform resource allocation.
- Provide a level of consistency in planning formats

### Other matters of discussion

- AAG recommendation should be made to PBC
- Role and size of AAG advisory committee - more faculty needed-Jessica could replace David Johnson as IPC rep
- AAG still needs to meet and discuss how we will provide a report of college-wide efforts regarding SLOs/PLOs



## RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLANNING AND BUDGETING COUNCIL

### Revision of Program Review Feedback Forms

1. All PCs establish, review and revise a feedback form to evaluate program reviews.
2. The revised feedback form needs to include overall recommendations and commendations of the program with input from dean on the vitality of the program:
  - Scale for program effectiveness:
    - Highly Effective
    - Effective
    - Needs Improvement and Support
3. The revised feedback form should include a way to flag possible evidence for accreditation (examples of significant impacts of resource requests, impacts of SLOs, etc.)

### Resource requests

4. Clarify and refine the prioritization, allocation, and feedback process to ensure that is transparent and consistent across the college.
5. Clarify the assignments of individuals compiling, reviewing and approving the resource requests.

### Training Needs

Train:

6. Program review teams/authors on the program review writing and assessment measuring, as well as the feedback form.
7. Planning Council reviewers to provide constructive criticism on the feedback form.
8. Faculty and staff how to request resources and how to identify what items should be included in resource requests.
9. Deans/directors how to monitor program review resource requests, prioritization, and categorization, as well as what items should be included in resources requests.