



FULLERTON COLLEGE - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Program Review Committee Report to Faculty Senate

2012-2013 Program Review

Introduction

The members of the Program Review Committee have completed reading, analyzing, and discussing fifty-two program review self-studies submitted by Fullerton College administrative and operations offices and student and support services programs. Every department filled out a reporting form that asked departments to state their relationship to the College's mission, analyze appropriate data, describe the status of service area outcome/student learning outcome assessments, examine their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges, set short and long-term goals, and make resource requests based on the data analysis in the previous sections of the report.

The three-fold responsibility of the Program Review Committee was to: 1) identify common themes throughout the various self-studies, 2) comment on each report's coherence and 3) evaluate the data in support of resource requests. The committee provided an individualized response to each of the fifty-two self-study authors. This response, called the Readers' Report, gives each program feedback about its self-study. It also provides each program an opportunity to respond to the Reader's Report.

This report identifies the common themes of the self-studies. It includes appendices of program goals and resource requests.

Common Themes (unranked)

1. **Staffing.** In many self-studies, a trained and very dedicated staff, committed to the goals of the college, was identified as a strength. A recurrent theme was the importance of replacing staff positions left vacant during the hiring freeze or as the result of cuts in categorical funding. The loss of positions and the combination of positions have created heavier workloads for the remaining staff. The overall effect of the loss of positions was a decrease in program efficiency and productivity. Some reports cited that staff members were required to assume duties for which they lacked adequate training.
2. **Lack of institutional support for research data, analysis and support.** Many self-studies reported that it was difficult to obtain sufficient data and support from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The studies spoke of the ever-increasing need for appropriate staffing of the office. The paradox of claiming to make "data driven decisions" while not adequately staffing the very office relied upon to provide such data was pointed out.
3. **Technology.** Numerous departments identified inadequate means of keeping current with technology in order to maintain and advance their programs and services.
4. **Web Site Development and Support.** Programs identified a need for assistance with regard to web site development and maintenance to improve customer service to students. The absence of a web administrator and web designer on staff makes development, implementation and maintenance a challenge. Training existing staff to maintain the web sites is also perceived as an obstacle.

5. **Social Media.** There is an increasing recognition of the value of social media to connect with students and the campus community. Some self-studies use social media feedback as data for their self-studies.
6. **Satisfaction Surveys.** Some programs reported using satisfaction surveys as the most often utilized method of outcome assessment to evaluate customer service. Other programs reported that satisfaction surveys are in development. There is a heavy reliance on satisfaction surveys as the primary method of service area outcome assessment.
7. **On-Line Self Service.** The self-studies identified a growing trend toward offering services on-line in addition to traditional service methods.

Resource Requests

In their program review reports, departments made a total of 176 requests for resources, totaling over \$59 million, which are listed in a spreadsheet appendix to this document. The committee members reviewed each request. A “yes” in the final column indicates that the committee found that the data analysis and narrative explanation in the report supported the request. The committee’s “yes” response distinguishes between data-driven resource requests and those that did not appear to derive from the data analysis, goals and other narrative sections of the report. The committee’s “yes” response to a resource request in no way guarantees that the request will be funded. However, it does give added weight to the request in the college’s planning and budget allocation process. If a request did not receive a “yes,” or will not receive funding in 2013-2014, a department may re-submit the request in subsequent program review reports. It is recommended that if a department resubmits a request that did not receive a “yes”, they support that request with data.

The program review self-studies made a total of \$59 million in resource requests. If the facilities requests are removed from the total, \$7.65 million in requests were made. Without including facilities and personnel requests, \$3.92 million in requests were made. Of the 176 requests, 82 were given a “yes” by the committee. These requests marked with a “yes” totaled \$3.15 million if facility and personnel requests are omitted. Resource requests not given a “yes” totaled \$800,000.

Category	Total requested amount	Amount supported by Committee
Management	\$309,823	\$183,340
Faculty – F/T & Adj.	\$1,899,466	\$682,874
Classified staff	\$1,331,874	\$606,962
Hourly staff	\$181,600	\$122,100
Equipment	\$3,248,866	\$2,869,039
Computers	\$348,500	\$73,500
Software	\$192,142	\$155,066
Supplies	\$25,850	\$23,350
Facilities	\$51,445,000	\$50,780,000
Staff development	\$33,064	\$14,800
Other	\$74,200	\$37,000
Totals	\$59,090,385	\$55,548,031

Conclusion

The Program Review Committee recognizes that 2012-13 represents the second installment in a two-year cycle of a revised process of program review at Fullerton College. This year continued last year's attempt to make a concerted effort to link program review to planning and budget decisions. Over this two-year period, the program review committee reviewed self-studies from 50 academic programs and 52 administrative, operational, support and student services departments. Throughout the two-year period, the committee has actively engaged in revising and refining the process in the spirit of continuous quality improvement.

In this review year, each program provided either existing or new service area outcomes/student learning outcomes. The program review self-studies continued to reveal a great deal of variation across the campus with respect to the quality of service area outcomes/student learning outcomes. Most programs have complied with service area outcome/student learning outcome requirements, but not all programs are effectively utilizing their assessments to improve services. For continuing quality improvement, the program review committee recommends providing training to the campus in the writing, implementation and assessment of service area outcomes/student learning outcomes.

Access to program data and systems for collecting it hindered programs from robust analysis. The program review committee continues to see the need for training in the effective access, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. This would help provide a stronger link between the data analysis section and resource requests section of the self-study.

After reviewing the self-studies, the Program Review Committee urges the college to adopt a funded Technology Maintenance and Replacement Plan to handle computer requests in a systematic, cost-effective manner that avoids duplication of effort and expense and addresses the ongoing need to make software upgrades.

The Program Review Committee sees value in a campus-wide approach to the use of surveys, reflecting best practices, good survey development, and a collection system that is efficient and effective. However, the committee also recommends that the college examine other evaluation methods for use by programs in their self-studies. Systematic training for development and use of assessment instruments of various types would result in improvements to the program review process and the ability of programs to evaluate the effectiveness of their processes as part of a continuous quality improvement effort.