FULLERTON COLLEGE - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Program Review Committee Summary Report to Faculty Senate, April 16, 2015

2014-2015 Program Review: Instructional Programs

Introduction

The members of the Program Review Committee have completed reading, analyzing, and discussing 52 program review self-studies submitted by Fullerton College instructional programs. Every department, except three, filled out a reporting form that asked departments to state their relationship to the College's mission, analyze appropriate data, describe the status of program 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.

Due to extenuating circumstances, Real Estate and Computer Science did not submit program review reports, and the report from Dance was incomplete.

It is the recommendation of the Program Review Committee that Real Estate, Computer Science, and Dance submit program review reports in fall 2015.

The Program Review Committee identified the following Program Reviews as "exemplary:"

Biology
Chemistry
Earth Sciences
English
Foreign Language
Mathematics
Nutrition
Theatre

The last instructional program review cycle was conducted in 2011-12.   Changes to the program review report included (1) a change in vocabulary from *Short Term Goals* to *Strategic Action Plans (SAPs)*, (2) the placing of *Resource Requests* directly into the *Strategic Action Plans* section, (3) the change from SLOA assessment at the course level to SLOA assessment at the program level.

 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 and data analysis in support of

resource requests. The committee provided an individualized response to each of the 52 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 Strategic Action Plans and Resource Requests.

General Observations

There was great variety in the scale and quality of the self-studies submitted by the instructional programs at Fullerton College in the fall of 2014. Instructional programs which sought institutional support for new plans, technology and equipment upgrades, staffing, and facilities wrote more extensively in support of their Strategic Action Plans and Resource Requests. Programs that limited their data analysis to Key Performance Indicators only positioned themselves to be merely compliant with program review requirements but, as a result, limited the scope and scale of their program analysis and planning.

The Program Review Committee provided a wide array of on-line resources and in–person training and coaching sessions. Not all programs utilized those training options, and some of the misinterpretations of the prompts contained with the program review report may be traced to not taking full advantage of the training options offered to the program review authors.

Common Themes (unranked)

1. **Faculty Staffing**.
In many self-studies, a trained and very dedicated faculty, committed to the goals of the college, was identified as a strength. A recurrent theme was the importance of replacing faculty positions left vacant during the hiring freeze or as the result of more recent resignations and retirements or the importance of adding growth positions to meet student enrollment and program expansion demands.

2. **Support for and from the Office of Institutional Research**:
Program Review represents a tremendous workload issue for participating faculty. The authors benefited from institutional support for KPI research data, but were left on their own to pursue comparative information from other schools, transfer data, job placement data, workplace trends, and industry changes that could influence program goals and planning. Because of the time frame involved, many self-studies reported that it was difficult to obtain sufficient additional data and support from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Program Review Committee acknowledges improvements made in adding staff to the Office of Institutional Research. This was a major theme from the Program Review report from 2013-14, which spoke of the ever-increasing need for appropriate staffing of the office. In that themes report,

Program Review noted "The paradox of claiming to make "data driven decisions" while not adequately staffing the very office relied upon to provide such data." The Program Review Committee appreciates the data provided by the OIRP, and looks forward to increased services offered to the campus units preparing future Program Review reports.

3. **Faculty Workload**: A recurrent theme among the instructional program self-studies was an increase in non-teaching responsibilities of the faculty at Fullerton College.   The amount of additional work required for Program Review and SLOA work were cited as taking away from faculty focus on the teaching required in their subject areas.   No one disputed the importance of faculty discussion and planning, but the workload demands have become extraordinary. The problem is further complicated by the decision of some full time faculty not to participate in program review, leaving the work to their colleagues.

4. **Technology and Equipment**. Numerous departments identified inadequate means of keeping current with technology in order to maintain and advance their programs and services.   The same departments stressed the importance of a computer technology replacement plan with consistent annual funding. Equally important to numerous departments with large equipment inventories was the request for consistent funding for instructional equipment.

5. **Web Site Development and Support**. Programs identified a need for assistance with regard to web site development and maintenance to improve a variety of web-based services to students, prospective students, alumni, and the general public.   The Program Review Committee is encouraged by the hiring of a new web content specialist in the Office of Communications, which was a theme request from Program Review, 2013-14.

6. **Social Media and Mobile Applications**. There is a continuing recognition of the value of social media to connect with students and the campus community. Information delivery systems need to be compatible with mobile devices.

7. **Facilities Upgrades**.   A number of programs identified significant facility requests, both to existing facilities and building replacements. At the time of the writing of the Program Review reports, the outcome of Measure J had not yet been decided. Several programs advanced the idea of a STEM Center on campus. Those programs considered a part of proposed new bond measure funded construction wrote extensively about their facilities needs.

8. **Adjunct faculty**. Some studies cited a non-competitive salary schedule as an issue affecting the hiring and retaining of adjunct faculty at NOCCCD.   Others identified the importance of developing adjunct faculty training through attracting graduate students and others interested in teaching community college as a career.   A separate issue is how to involve adjunct faculty in SLOA work, when adjunct faculty are the only instructors of specific courses.

9. **Supplemental Instruction**. A number of self-studies identified the importance of tutoring and supplemental instruction to student success. Some programs use graduate students for s.i. Participating programs find it difficult to access supporting data and to find additional classroom space to accommodate supplemental instruction.

10. **On-line Instruction**: It is an observation of the Program Review Committee that self studies authors should have access to KPI data disaggregated to compare performance date for students enrolled in on-line versus in-person classes.

11. **Room Scheduling**:   Some program reviews identified room scheduling as a challenge, citing the loss of rooms to other departments or divisions with no recourse to gain them back. Some programs simply cannot grow without access to additional classrooms.

12. **Special event funding**. A wide variety of special programming funding requests was made. The events included planning retreats, guest lecturers, guest artists, and theme based campus events.   The proposed and existing events either supported program decision-making, community outreach, or provided students with expert advice on topics relevant to their major area of study.

Resource Requests

In their program review reports, departments made a total of 236 requests for resource funding.

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 distinguished 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," it either received a "Provisional approval" or a "Not supported." When receiving a Provisional approval, the authors were given 10 days to improve specific Strategic Action Plans, but authors were not permitted to rewrite any other sections of the report.   A "Not supported" comment means that the resource request was not supported with sufficient data or analysis in the earlier sections of the self-study.   That designation does not guarantee that no funding will be offered for the proposal; rather it means that for future funding to take place, the decision makers will need to see additional information to warrant funding for a proposal not supported in program review.

The program review self-studies made a total of $21 million in resource requests. If the facilities requests are removed from the total, $9.7 million in requests were made. Without including facilities and personnel requests, $4.2 million in requests were made. Of the 236 requests, 181 were given a "yes" by the committee, 20 "provisional approval", and 35 "no." These requests marked with a "yes" totaled $3 million if facility and personnel requests are omitted. Resource requests not given a "yes" totaled $1.2 million.

The Program Review Committee would like the PBSC to be aware that at the time the Program Review reports were being developed in early fall 2014, it was not yet clear what fall 2014 allocations for instructional equipment, computer technology, lottery funds, and faculty replacement positions were being made. By late fall 2014 some of the strategic action plans and resource requests were supported with partial or complete funding. For a full evaluation of the resource requests by the PBSC the allocations from fall 2014 should be cross-referenced. The Program Review Committee requests that the Deans and Managers update the Resource Request list before final consideration for funding by the PBSC.

Conclusion

The Program Review Committee recognizes that 2014-15 represents the fourth installment in a six-year cycle of a revised 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 seven-year period, the program review committee evaluated self-studies from over 50 academic programs and over 50 administrative, operational, support and student services departments. Throughout the six-year period, the committee has actively engaged in revising and refining the process in the spirit of continuous quality improvement.

2009-10 Program Review from all College programs
2010-11 Program Review -- Planning Year
2011-12 Program Review -- Instructional Programs
2012-13 Program Review -- Student Services, Operational Programs, and Offices
2013-14 Program Review -- Planning Year
2014-15 Program Review – Instructional Programs

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. Although the Program Review Coordinator scheduled numerous training sessions, created tutorial videos and made herself available for program review coaching, the campus community did not fully utilize those opportunities for training.

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 Committee also requests for an Instructional Equipment Replacement Plan.

For faculty to believe in the process and invest the long hours required to research, discuss, and develop robust program review reports, they need to

1. See a correlation between the work required and the outcomes that will advance their programs. They need to see a connection between program review, planning, and resource allocations.

2. Have access to additional data to support their research and planning efforts. To effectively gain the information in time for program review work to proceed, the process of requesting and studying information has to occur far in advance of the fall semester in which the writing of the program reviews takes place.

3. Have the Deans exert more influence to get the program review process to start earlier, have faculty share responsibilities, help faculty access other relevant data by organizing requests to the Office of Institution Research and engage the departments in strategic planning that will translate into outstanding program self studies.   The Deans need to better mentor program review reports that are below standard before they are submitted.

The Program Review Committee thanks the faculty and staff at Fullerton College for their active and improving participation in the Program Review Process. The Program Review Chair also acknowledges the time and quality of commitment made by the faculty, staff, and managers who participated as Program Review Committee members.