



FULLERTON COLLEGE - PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Program Review Committee (PRC) Summary Report to Faculty Senate,
December 1, 2016

2015-2016 Program Review: Annual Program Review Update

Both instructional and non-instructional programs completed the first Annual Program Review Update (APRU) in fall 2016. The programs were asked to submit an evidence-based update on new action plans, outcomes modifications, personnel changes, technology needs, and capital expenditure needs that occur between comprehensive three-year reviews. A total of 121 annual updates were submitted and only 12 programs did not submit the APRU. One instructional program that did not submit their APRU is currently in the process of hiring a full-time faculty member and five others did not because of management changes that prevented their submissions. Some of the non-instructional areas were not separately submitted, but were combined and reported in another APRU. The PRC encourages these programs that did not submit a report to do so as soon as possible and join the rest of the departments in reporting regularly in the fall.

The Program Review Committee divided into smaller workgroups and each workgroup read approximately twelve APRUs. Due to the lack of time to read reports and the fact they are not comprehensive, the PRC did not generate a Reader's Report for each update, but simply endorsed any resource requests provided. The PRC endorsed most of the resource requests; there were three requests not endorsed because they did not complete the update form in its entirety. Appended to this report is a summary of the resource requests. The spreadsheet with all resource requests is available upon request and distributed at this Faculty Senate meeting. With the approval of Faculty Senate, this report and the spreadsheets will be forwarded to both the President's Advisory Council (PAC) and the Planning and Budgeting Steering Committee (PBSC).

While most programs provided sufficient justification for resource requests, there was some confusion as to what should be included in the APRU. A summary of issues the PRC has discussed in regards to the annual report follows:

- 1) A better description of what needs to be included in the annual report.
- 2) A review of which programs submit reports and a notification process to a designated lead person of the timeline needs attention.
- 3) The timing of the PR annual reports is not optimal. Both the PRC and administration receive faculty hiring allocations and instructional supply requests in what appears to be an inverted order. Hiring and budgeting are shared governance decisions, and input from the PRC impacts the timing of planning and budgeting on the campus. The next semester provides an opportunity to evaluate both the comprehensive three-year and annual process and their subsequent timing.
- 4) Items programs choose to include in the APRU should not be included in the three – year comprehensive review.
- 5) The annual update form is not just an instructional equipment supply list and may include updated information that may not include resource requests.
- 6) Annual updates inform decisions at the campus level based on program review input from all departments and all departments should participate.

The PRC has concerns about not the number of resource requests, but the total amount of resource requests in the annual update. It seems that the annual requests should be considerably less than requests in the three-year comprehensive review, but they are not. Since this is the first submission of the annual report, perhaps the number and/or amount of resource requests will go down next fall. The intent of the annual report is that it is an update and not as thorough as the three year comprehensive self-study. In Fall 2017, instructional programs will submit their comprehensive three year self-studies while non-instructional areas will complete their next annual update. The PRC will then re-evaluate the focus and effectiveness of both reports at that time.

Appendix A – Resource Request Summary

<i>Non-instructional</i>		<i>Instructional</i>	
Personnel	\$1,328,142.00	Personnel	\$1,754,742.00
Facilities	\$290,000.00	Facilities	\$1,124,700.00
Equipment	\$510,199.96	Equipment	\$1,721,459.00
Supplies	\$11,500.00	Supplies	\$160,416.00
Computer Hardware	\$28,065.00	Computer Hardware	\$698,619.00
Computer Software	\$8,500.00	Computer Software	\$292,886.00
Other	\$8,200.00	Training and Other	\$131,700.00
		w/o "No" Endorsements	\$5,733,170.00
Total	\$2,184,606.96	Total	\$5,733,170.00
w/o personnel	\$856,464.96	w/o personnel	3,978,428.00
w/o personnel & facilities	\$566,464.96	w/o personnel & facilities	\$2,853,728.00
w/o personnel, facilities & comp hardware	\$538,399.96	w/o personnel, facilities & comp hardware	\$2,155,109.00
Both Non_instructional and Instructional Totals	\$7,917,776.96	Both Non_instructional and Instructional excluding personnel, facilities, & hardware	\$2,693,508.96

The categories and funding assigned as numbers used in the Excel spreadsheets are:

***Categories**

- 1 Personnel
- 2 Facilities
- 3 Equipment
- 4 Supplies
- 5 Computer Hardware
- 6 Computer Software
- 7 Training
- 8 Other

Funding

- 8 Other
- 9 BS, SSSP Funds, Student Equity
- 10 CTE, Perkins Grants
- 11 Instructional Equipment
- 12 Technology Funds
- 13 General
- 14 Hire
- 15 Strong Workforce Initiative
- 16 District Funding