

# Annual Evaluation of Program Review 2011-2012

The program review process is evaluated annually as part of integrated planning. The results of this evaluation are used for process improvement. Section 1 (Measures of Effectiveness) come from the Program Review Committee. Section 2 (Program Review Committee Self-Evaluation) is written by the Program Review Committee. Section 3 (Evaluation) is completed by the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee (IPCC), based on the information presented in Sections 1 and 2.

## 1. Measures of Effectiveness

1.1. Percent of programs completing program reviews in 2011-2012:

	Number of Programs	Number of Programs Completing Program Review	Percent of Programs Completing Program Review
Instructional Programs	64	59	94%
Student Services Programs	18	18	100%
Administrative Services Programs	14	10	71%

1.2. Percent of programs using student learning outcomes (SLOs/PLOs) for program improvement in 2011-2012:

	Number of Programs	Number of Programs Documenting Use of SLOs for Program Improvement	Percent of Programs Documenting Use of SLOs for Program Improvement
Instructional Programs	64	40	63.5%
Student Services Programs	18	17	94.5%
Administrative Services Programs	14	3	21.5%

1.3. Percent of resource requests from program review that were validated in 2010-2011 and continued in the resource allocation process:

	Number of Requests*	Number of Requests Validated	Percent of Requests Validated	Number of Requests "Not Supported" by Program Review (Did not go forward)	Number of Personnel Requests Submitted (Did not require validation this year)
Instructional Programs	110	55	50%	16	42
Student Services Programs	35	18	52%	0	17
Administrative Services Programs	33	19	58%	0	14

*\*This category does not include personnel requests. Program Review did not have the resources or time to validate personnel requests due to the short turnaround time to be forwarded to the appropriate hiring committees.*

1.4. Percent of validated resource requests from program review that were funded:

	Number of Validated Requests	Number of Validated Requests That Were Funded	Percent of Validated Requests That Were Funded	Number of Personnel Requests Submitted	Percent of Personnel Requests That Were Funded
Instructional Programs	55			42	
Student Services Programs	18			17	
Administrative Services	19			14	

Programs						
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

## 2. Program Review Committee Self-Evaluation

The Program Review Committee evaluates the process in 2011-2012 by supplying the narrative below. The narrative should focus on the following components of the ACCJC rubric for evaluating program review:

- Are program review processes used to assess and improve student learning and achievement?
- Are the results of program review used to continually refine and improve program practices?
- Are the results of program review used to improve student achievement and learning?

### Processes

The process of completing the program review document required divisions and departments to review and evaluate their assessments to determine changes which could improve student learning and achievement as well as to respond to the needs of students.

The following excerpts from the document show the focus on student learning:

*List the current major strengths of the program*

*List the current weaknesses of the program*

#### 1.0 Trend Analysis

*1.1 Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning*

#### 2.0 Student Learning and Curriculum

*2.2.b. Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/ programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.*

*2.3.b. Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/ programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.*

*2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.*

*3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes.*

### Improvements

Curriculum Review was a common element of improvements defined by many instructional divisions along with teaching methodology and practices, student resources, and class sequencing. The document asks divisions/departments to list their most significant achievement since last year's report. Non-Credit ESL stated that meaningful outcomes had been established to replace long-standing primarily grammatical objectives. The outcomes were based on student-identified goals of matriculation into credit programs and entry into the job force. The program focused on refining current assessment practices and creating new assessments based on a Bloom's taxonomy level.

Using the assessment data from the Biology Health Science PLO, the division submitted a grant proposal to the GCC foundation requesting funding for

additional models and skeletons for use in the Anatomy and Human Biology courses. The grant proposal was approved and these models will contribute to student learning by providing greater access to study materials in the laboratories and in the Tom Rike Biology Study Room.

The results of the assessments in Nursing lab/seminar courses NS 201, 202, 203, and 214, have implemented simulation as teaching methodology into their curriculum. Simulation is designed to enhance student learning and experiences for preparation in the clinical areas. Also, practicum has been added into the core medical/surgical classes in each semester for psychomotor skills success and clinical enhancement prior to clinical rotation entry.

### **Results**

As a result of assessments:

Based on assessments of Chemistry 110, it was discovered that only 64 to 83% of students were achieving the SLO'. A lab manual was written to give the student more practice in problem solving techniques that will help them to improve their success in achieving their SLO's

In Math's first year of giving a common final, a significant difference in the GPA of students taught by adjuncts and that of full time instructors was determined, yet the performance of adjuncts' students on exams was significantly lower than that of full-time instructor's students. Data was used to show the discrepancy and the topics that needed to be emphasized. Since the first year there has been a swing in data with the adjuncts' scoring results more closely aligning with the full-timers' scores. Workshops are held each semester to improve the assessments.

The Nursing Department added clinical practicum skills tests for students when they realized some hospital areas were simply not conducive to student learning. Assessment of lab/seminar courses led to implementation of simulation as a teaching methodology into core medical./surgical classes and has led to psychomotor skills success and clinical enhancement prior to clinical rotation entry.

Non-Credit ESL changes from assessments included the addition of a writing component to their placement exam and a writing and speaking component to their exit exams.

Admissions & Records is now tracking student complaints to identify common issues and enable the department to strategize ways to reduce them.

Based on survey feedback, Financial Aid has increased the number of students getting their own information

EOPS has introduced probation contracts for students which has resulted in improved GPAs.

### **Self Evaluation**

Additionally, the results of program review are assessed each year by the Program Review Committee through an exit survey distributed to all divisions/programs that

participated in the process that year. The program review manager and faculty coordinator synthesize the information and present it to the entire committee for discussion, which results in improvements to the document annually. Additionally, the manager and coordinator solicit feedback from the IPCC and engage in discussion with the instructional V. P. and members of the Core 5 group to discuss the focus for the next year's document. The focus for the 2011-2012 document was SLO/PLO assessment status information in anticipation of the fall 2012 SLO Proficiency reporting for the ACCJC.

### 3. Evaluation

3.1. Based on the information presented above, evaluate the extent to which the program review process meets the following criteria:

	0 (not at all)	1	2	3 (very well)
Program review is implemented regularly				X
Results of program review are used in decision-making			X	
Results of program review are linked to resource allocation			X	
Results of program review are used to improve programs			X	
Results of program review are used to improve student learning			X	
Program review informs ongoing college planning			?	

3.2. Based on this evaluation, make recommendations for improving the program review process.

Pending exit survey data