



2010 -2011

Program Review

YEAR END REPORT

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Overview of 2010-2011 Annual Reporting Process	4
Programs Reporting	5
Resource Requests	6
Annual Evaluation of Program Review	7
Improvements in Student Learning and Programs	11
Exit Survey Results	24
Document Samples	27
Instructional Programs Report Template	
Student Services Report Template	
Resource Request Validation Form	
Administrative Programs Report Template	

INTRODUCTION

In response to the college being placed on “Warning” status from the 2010 accreditation site visit and the primary recommendation from the 2010 Accreditation Site Visit, an annual program review reporting process was developed.

Recommendation 1. *Building on a recommendation made by the 2004 evaluation team, the team recommends that the college strengthen the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes in order to:*

Establish and publish a clear timeline and specific outcomes for the integration of the planning processes;

- a. Establish and implement formal and systematic processes for assessing the effectiveness of the planning, program review, and resource allocation processes that include clear measures of effectiveness and direct evidence;*
- b. Ensure that the implementation of integrated planning and resource allocation is not solely dependent upon the receipt of new revenue, but rather focuses on continuous improvement even if this requires reallocating or reprioritizing the use of existing resources;*
- c. Assign administrative responsibility and accountability for the implementation of plans;*
- d. Align the program review cycle and the annual planning and budget cycles to ensure that planning and resource allocation are data-driven and based upon annual outcome measures;***
- e. Clarify, document and review the multiple paths for requesting resources;*
- f. Ensure an integrated process for continuous improvement of the planning process; and*
- g. Facilitate increased campus wide awareness and understanding of the college’s integrated planning and decision-making processes*
(Standards IB.2, IB.3, IB.4, IB.6, IB.7, IIIA.6, IIID.1.a, IIID.1.b, IIID.3)

The revised model integrating planning, program review, and resource allocation took effect at the beginning of the fall 2010 semester. The key features of the revised model are an annual program review reporting process; a simplified, integrated resource request process; and systematic evaluation of all processes to ensure continuous improvement.

Overview of the 2010-2011 Annual Program Review Reporting Process

In summer 2010, the Program Review Committee (PRC) developed a streamline annual program review document which was distributed to Instructional and Student Services programs at the beginning of the fall semester for completion in early December. The three page template included questions concerning the following:

Relationship to the college mission

Student achievement data (for instructional programs)
Individual data gathered by each student service program

Data and questions regarding SLOs and assessment progress and results

The evaluation of previous program goals

Matrix chart for new action plans, their relationship to the EMP Goals and SLOs, how the action will improve student learning and any resource needs

A Resource Request Form which asked what planning goal, core competency, or SLO the request addressed, what measurable outcome would result from the requested item and a detailed description.

Personnel hiring requests were done early so that they would align with the previously established instructional, student services and classified personnel hiring committees (IHAC, SSHAC and CHAC). Faculty requests were due near the end of October and the classified employee requests were not due until February. This created a little anxiety for the instructional programs to complete their requests over a month before the report was due. After the reports were submitted in December, all of the resource requests were logged and coded and each request was validated by the Program Review Committee.

The new streamlined document was developed by the PRC that would ask questions in a format that designed to provide information that would build a platform to support needed resource requests by each program. A validation tool was also developed by the Program Review Committee for individual resource requests prior to having them move forward to the various campus standing committees for prioritization.

Samples of the 2010-2011 reporting documents can be found at the end of this report.

PROGRAMS REPORTING

ALL 16 Instructional Divisions which included 65 programs

- Biology
- Business
- Continuing Education-Business & Life Skills
- English
- ESL
- Health Sciences
- Health & P.E.
- Language Arts
- Library Sciences
- Math
- Non-Credit ESL
- Physical Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Student Development
- Technical Education (CTE)
- Visual & Performing Arts

ALL 9 Student Service Areas which included 18 programs

- Admissions & Records
- CalWORKS
- Disabled Students
- EOPS
- Financial Aid
- Health Center
- Library & Learning Resources
- Student Affairs
- Student Services

13 Administrative Areas reported

- Business Services
- Campus Police
- Community Services Education
- Facilities
- Fiscal Services
- Food Services
- Foundation
- Human Resources
- Information Technology
- PACE
- Parent Education Center
- Title V / ACE
- Workforce Development

RESOURCE REQUESTS

<u>Program</u>	<u># of ALL Requests</u>
Instructional Programs	103
Student Service Programs	39
Administrative	40
Total	182

Resource requests were categorized as follows:

Personnel Requests:	<u>Instructional</u>	<u>Student Services</u>	<u>Administrative</u>	<u>Total</u>
Faculty Hiring Requests (IHAC)	34			34
Faculty Hiring Requests (SSHAC)*		3		3
Classified Employees (CHAC)	8	9	12	29
RTEP, EM, Collaboratives	13	3		16
Admin/Mgr/Conf. Requests	0	7	4	11
TOTAL	55	22	16	93

**Note: Some SSHAC requests may not have processed through the program review process this year*

Non-Personnel Requests:	<u>Instructional</u>	<u>Student Services</u>	<u>Administrative</u>	<u>Total</u>
New facilities or classroom space	3			3
Redesign/remodel existing space	6	2	2	10
Classroom Upgrades	3			3
Non-Instructional Equipment	2		4	6
Instructional Equipment	15	1		16
Supplies	4	1		5
Maintenance contracts	1			1
Software, database, licenses	3	3		6
New Computer Equipment (CPUs, laptops, printers, etc.)	11	3	12 (IT)	26
Training/Staff Dev./Conf.	1			1
Collaborative Projects	5			5
Transportation/Field Trip	1	2		3
Miscellaneous/Other*	2		2	4
TOTAL	57	12	20	89

*Other included: Additional hours/adjuncts/lab techs/clerical support, advertising/marketing, signage, permanent location



ANNUAL EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REVIEW 2010-2011

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.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Creation of new documents to meet the requirements of the new integrated planning process in response to Recommendation 1.
- Conversion to an annual program review reporting process.
- Stronger ties to SLOs, resource requests and planning
- Division-wide reporting rather than individual program reporting
- Addition of new administrative reporting document

STRENGTHS

- Participation in the new annual process was close to 100%
- Streamlined reporting document with more focused questions
- Enhanced transparency regarding resource requests
- Exit surveys provided valuable feedback for improvements to next year's document
- Annual process created a more even playing field for all programs

WEAKNESSES

- Personnel requests required multiple hiring committee processes, resulting in multiple forms to be completed, as well as redundancy.
- Multi-program divisions reported difficulty and some confusion in how to complete the form.
- There was confusion in the processing of resource requests (which committees would prioritize and resource requests with multiple items)
- Due to the time crunch the new process was developed piece by piece, necessitating the solving of problems as we went along, changing timeline, and difficulty envisioning the overall process for all concerned.

1. Measures of Effectiveness

Percent of programs completing program reviews in 2010-2011:

	Number of Programs	Number of Programs Completing Program Review	Percent of Programs Completing Program Review
Instructional Programs	16	16	100%
Student Services Programs	19	18	95%
Administrative Services Programs	17	14	82%

1.1. Percent of programs using student learning outcomes for program improvement in 2010-2011:

	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	16	7	43%	
Student Services Programs	19	17	89%	1 program did not report
Administrative Services Programs	17	0	0	SLOs are new to Admin. programs

1.2. 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*
Instructional Programs	104	56	54%
Student Services Programs	39	16	41%
Administrative Services Programs	40	22	55%

**Note-personnel requests etc. were not validated by the PRC, but went to appropriate 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
Instructional Programs	104	NA at this time	NA at this time
Student Services Programs	39		
Administrative Services Programs	34		

Funding is undetermined at this time (June 2011)

2. Program Review Committee Self-Evaluation

The Program Review Committee evaluates the process in 2010-2011 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?

The 2010 program review document requested information on how assessments are used to improve student learning and achievement. Responses varied in the depth of information provided. Programs have indicated that they would like to see examples of effective SLOs and their assessments.

Each year program review committee has worked with the SLO Committee to improve the questions asked in the SLO section of the document. The specific questions above are not currently included in the 2010 program review document, but will be added to the SLO section of the document in future years. This past year, the program review committee worked diligently to produce a new streamlined document for the first annual process. After developing the reporting document, the committee then realized the need to develop companion documents, etc. For example, additional forms were developed for personnel requests (IHAC, SSHAC and CHAC hiring committees) and also with a validation tool for resource requests. The creation of these documents extended until the last week prior to launching the project. In retrospect, all documents used in the process need to be available and public prior to the start of the project.

The committee was completing the details of the new annual process as we went along. Many lessons have been learned over the past year and the committee is strategizing improvements and solutions for the next cycle.

The 2010 document was divided into four sections that intended to be used for a program to “build a case” for resource requests. This became the emphasis for most programs in this first year of the new annual process. In retrospect, while this emphasis did result in nearly 100% participation for the first year. It did not focus closely enough on the primary issue of SLOACs or on a continuous cycle of improvement.

The majority of programs discussed SLOAC improvement or a plan to complete their assessments. In some instances, authors indicated the rewriting or developing assessments would be beneficial.

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	The new annual process started fall 2010.
Results of program review are used in campuswide decision-making			X		The Program Review Annual Report is forwarded for review to the Budget Committee and to major campus planning/decision-making bodies such as the IPCC and Team A and Team B.
Results of program review are linked to resource allocation				X	Program Review resource requests are forwarded to the appropriate standing committees for prioritization as part of the decision-making process.
Results of program review are used to improve programs			X		The results of the 2010 program review process have resulted in improvements to programs (See evidence in this report-page XX)
Results of program review are used to improve student learning			X		The results of the 2010 program review process have resulted in improvements to student learning (See evidence in this report-page XX)
Program review informs ongoing college planning			X		The Program Review Annual Report is forwarded for review to the Budget Committee and to major campus planning/decision-making bodies such as the IPCC and Team A and Team B. Additionally, the IPCC evaluates the program review process.

EXAMPLES OF PROGRAM REVIEW AND SLO ASSESSMENTS LEADING TO IMPROVEMENT IN STUDENT LEARNING AND PROGRAMS

The following responses were taken from Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the 2010 Program Review reports and provide evidence that improvements in student learning and programs are taking place. The list represents only a sampling of responses from the programs that responded to these specific questions.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Questions asked in 2010 Program Review Report

2.2 How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning?

2.3. How has the assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

3.3 Evaluate the success of completed actions (identified in your previous goals or other related plans). Did the completed actions lead to improved student learning or improved program division processes?

3.4 What modifications do you plan to make to your program/division in the future to improve student learning and/or program/division processes?

Biological Sciences

2.2 Students who take Biology 115 significantly increase their chances of success in Biology 120.

2.3 Of students completing the entire Biology series, over 70% were accepted at every four-year institution to which they applied.

3.3 Use of the new Biopac Student Lab System allowed students to have access to clearer graphs from which they could analyze data. SLOs for all biology courses have been written, and 84.6% of these courses have ongoing SLO assessment. Assessment of the Biological Sciences AA Degree Program SLO demonstrated that the acceptance rate was substantially higher for students who completed the entire biology series at GCC: 86% for UCLA and UCB after taking biology 103, compared to 41-50% after taking biology 101 and 102 only.

3.4 Using Survey Monkey, the Biological Sciences Division plans to continue to assess the AA Biological Sciences Degree Program SLOs by following the success of biology majors who have transferred to a four-year institution.

Business

2.2 Course-level student learning outcomes have forced faculty to review curriculum and collaborate on course standards. Some early assessments have shown a need to increase focus on contextual learning.

2.3 Only Accounting has created and assessed program SLOs, however, no program improvements have been recognized at this time. Business programs are continuously reviewed

and improved through Advisory committee recommendations along with community, student and faculty input.

3.3 Contacts and collaborations allow us to make our courses up-to-date and more “real” for students. Increased collaboration with Garfield campus constituents have allowed better communication, thus increasing enrollment and providing a smoother transition from non-credit to credit programs.

3.4 Continue to increase contacts and collaborations on and off campus to create new, meaningful courses leading to employment, transfer and other positive outcomes for students.

Continuing Education: Business/Life Skills

2.2 Course-level SLOs for the division provided relevant information to assist in assessing and improving programs.

3.3 Instructors have become more knowledgeable and competent in new technologies.

3.4 We plan to offer workshops on the versions of our application and operating system software.

English

2.2 Ongoing assessment of developmental composition and reading has directly impacted curriculum development and professional development. For example, the English 120 committee hosts regular best-practices to discuss issues connected to student learning manifest in the SLOAC assessment process; and assessment data from English 189 and English 191 is integral to measuring success of the division’s courses.

3.3 The revision of course outlines more effectively aligns courses, making the progression of sequential courses clearer to students. A more integrated curriculum has allowed for the development of extensive resources for instructors and students and has facilitated important dialog among instructors.

3.4 The division will continue to develop innovative curriculum that incorporates current research and effective use of technology. Efforts will focus not only on development of individual courses but also on the articulation of the English curriculum and the effective integration of that curriculum with CTE and College Services programs campus wide.

ESL

2.2 SLOACs have created a feedback loop which has led to changes in exams and to discussions about increased training for teachers regarding scoring rubrics. The newly implemented listening and speaking exams have created greater uniformity in testing.

3.3 New division-wide final exams have led to more discussion about the Listening and Speaking Curriculum; they have also led to plans for a FLEX activity on this topic for spring 2011.

3.4 We plan to provide more training for instructors on teaching methodology and on test creation and grading.

Health Sciences

2.2 The Alcohol and Drug Studies Program has realized a decrease in attrition rates and an increase in retention rates due to continued assessment of course-level SLOs. Data for the EMT Program's SLOs from 2007 to 2011 demonstrate that students are improving each year as more student needs are identified and changes made to the program.

2.3 Assessment of program-level SLOs has led to increased student satisfaction with their academic experience for the Alcohol and Drug Studies Program.

3.3 Achieved goals in the Alcohol and Drug Studies Program led to an increase in FTES, decreases in attrition rates, and increases in graduation rates.

Health and PE

2.2 Instructors continue to use SLOs to make adjustments to courses and to improve students success rates.

3.3 With the new computer software system, a safer environment has been created for the storage of athlete records. The new on-line application process has enabled more efficient processing of students and, as a result, staff can spend more time with students with low English skills.

Language Arts:

ASL

2.2 Assessments have led to more in-class conversational settings and impromptu in-class conversations and real-life interactions.

3.4 Goal setting through SLOs shows a need for online classes.

Foreign Language

2.2 SLOs have identified gaps in prior preparation, such as grammar. More time is now spent in class to fill these gaps and better enable students.

3.3 Students seem to learn more easily with the addition of increased technical support , Hybrid programs and more instructors.

3.4 Continual adaption to changing technology (such as Blackboard and hybrid classes) makes learning more attractive and accessible.

Journalism

3.3 New course offerings should benefit students by enabling them to build on the skills learned in previous classes and additionally enhance and expand the program.

Mass Communications

2.3 Bellwether questions on exams, and essay questions and term paper topics are reviewed and in some cases rewritten with SLOs in mind.

3.4 MC majors students invited to luncheon with department head to develop assessment of

progress and eventual transfer. A term paper evaluation form was developed to give students more feedback.

Speech Communication

2.2 Speech 101 assessment led to discussion regarding the research module and how much time should be devoted to it (time commitment for out of class learning of research and citing sources).

3.3 Instructors have me to discuss and evaluate student's performance, which has proved invaluable in providing insight for the program to set future goals.

3.4 Goal setting process led to conclusion that the wave of the future is hybrid and online classes for advanced classes which need to be effectively taught by faculty with "cutting edge" course work and recent degrees.

Forensics

2.2 Current SLOs will be rewritten to better reflect student need and the challenges of fees, travel and expenses and sustainable fundraising to provide this student opportunity.

Library Science

2.2 Program changes resulting from SLO data has encouraged more active learning for students.

3.4 We plan to complete an assessment cycle for the new hybrid course in order to determine its viability and determine the future for hybrid offerings in our division.

Math

2.2 By comparing results from short- and long-term SLOs, we can easily zero in on areas that provide the most difficulty for students, so instructors can determine the most critical aspects of the curriculum. This has led to workshops for faculty that target the major problems faced by students in a variety of courses. We have instituted workshops for students on problematic topics identified by SLOs. These continue to generate positive feedback from students.

2.3 Assessments pointed to a problem with prerequisites for our courses. This led to the development of the Math High School Collaborative, geared toward encouraging high school students to take mathematics in their senior year.

3.4 We plan to broaden the scope of the Math At-Risk/Retention Program. We will investigate the development of an intermediate algebra course that would serve as a prerequisite to Math 111, Math 135, Math 136, and Math 138.

Noncredit ESL

3.3 Overhead projectors, CD players, and grammar guides have led to improved instruction and student learning, since students can visualize and listen to the subjects being taught.

3.4 We plan to implement our newly designed written exit tests in Level 1 and Level 2 classes, and implement the oral exit exam in all levels. We also plan to review and enhance our conversation curriculum during winter session.

Physical Sciences

3.3 Storage of astronomy equipment has been resolved.

3.4 We plan to achieve clearer vision and management for the planetarium.

Student Development

2.2 Assessment of course-level outcomes has led to the revision of course outlines, increased sharing of teaching methods among faculty, and increased discussion about which SLOs are most important.

3.4 We plan to increase curriculum retreats to discuss teaching methods, SLOs, and classroom activities promoting student learning.

Visual and Performing Arts:

Music

2.2 Assessments identified strengths and weakness resulting in recommendations to allow additional practice time to increase student success.

2.3 The elimination of outdated certificates and fine-tuning transfer requirements has increased student success when they are at four-year transfer schools.

3.4 A planned move into a new facility with music specific classrooms, updated facilities and a recital hall.

Art History

2.2 Ongoing assessments have identified the need for more consistency between sections of the same course. Additional meetings of faculty have yielded closer alignment.

2.3 Program does not offer certificates.

3.3 SLO assessments have led to increased student success in critical thinking.

3.4 Continuation of SLOACs and regular faculty meetings allow continuous discussion on critical issues of the program.

Dance

2.2 Continuing assessments have led to constant course revision and updating.

2.3 SLO assessments and community need led to the creation of the Dance Teaching Certificate and has also led to immediate workforce employment.

3.3 Student success has increased. Regular meetings with dance majors has led to better student understanding and increased program retention.

3.4 The addition of another faculty member to assume program and divisional responsibilities is needed. As the program continues to flourish it is not possible to monitor or supervise all department activities and maintain the level of individual attention needed for the discipline.

Theater Arts

2.2 Assessment led to a more rigorous writing component in IGETC course. Four classes were examined and rewritten based on the skill levels for acting in GCC's student population.

3.3 A welcome meeting for students and faculty each semester and faculty- supervised Theatre Guild meetings, students are displaying and increased awareness of how to complete their educational goals. Advisement has also led to an increased interest in declaration of majors.

3.4 Examine repeatability of skill building courses which transfer (specifically CSUN). Commit to increase high school, community and audience outreach.

Photography

2.2 Assessment led to more unified courses consistent outcomes with skill levels more consistent for students continuing to advanced courses.

2.3 Assessments of 8 week courses showed a negative impact on student success which resulted in the elimination of these courses during fall and spring terms. Recent course revisions require further assessments.

3.3 Integration of new technologies have helped students to better prepare for professional work and allowed the development of professional internship opportunities.

3.4 Continue to refine courses and update certificates to reflect current curriculum and establish skill set awards that create marketable skills for students.

Graphic Design

2.2 Assessment identified weaknesses resulting in updating of courses

2.3 SLO assessments resulted in the creation of a new certificate, more reflective of current practice.

3.3 Students are now producing portfolio quality work to focus on transfer and job placement.

3.4 The program requires constant evolution of existing skills and the development of new technological skills. The program's goal is the addition of professional opportunities for students.

Media

2.3 Improvements in the Media program are achieved by maintaining a close watch on industry trends and the college's ability to respond quickly to changing industry needs.

3.3 Consultation with industry partners has identified potential growth areas: high definition studio production, digital cinematography and video via mobile devices and social networks.

3.4 In order to bring the program into a closer alignment with CSU media majors a new course has been developed as a core for the Film Studies area of emphasis. This effort will also help pave the way for development of a transfer degree. An application to become an authorized Apple Training Center is also in the works.

Animation

2.2 Extensive curriculum redesign and stabilizing enrollments in brand new courses. Assessments were just completed in the two Modeling courses.

2.3 New skill-set awards have been created. Updating the program curriculum is ongoing to maintain leadership in the field. The new Gaming program is the result of quick action to support a growing industry need.

3.3 Students now working in the industry are using what they learned in the program to diversity their work opportunities and experiences. Students who have not worked in the industry are working side-by-side with those who do. The quality of student work in all areas of digital animation is constantly improving.

3.4 As newly created courses become established work will be initiated to bridge from GCC animation program to internships at local animation, visual effects and video game businesses.

Ceramics

2.2 Assessments are in progress as if fall 2010.

3.3 Upgraded classrooms have allowed the use of digital images as part of classroom demonstrations and lectures (in-class demonstrations and off-site techniques) resulting in increased student access and comprehensions.

3.4 Studio Arts

2.2 Assessments showed that advanced students lacked capstone classes that synthesize advanced skills. Three new courses have been developed to bolster program outcomes.

2.3 Assessment of intermediate courses pointed out the importance of first-year education and the need for more time developing basic technical skills at the introductory level in order to succeed in the intermediate level. Faculty meet to review best practices for first year instruction.

3.3 The addition of a full-time lab tech has helped support faculty focus on instruction, more efficient resource management and the introduction of open lab hours.

3.4 Additional FTEF is requested to replace a retirement and to accommodate new capstone courses and retain students. Continuous maintenance is needed to maximize resource use and health and safety in the otherwise impacted studio area.

Student Support Service Programs

Questions asked in 2010 Program Review Report

2.1 How has assessment of student service outcomes led to improvement in your program or plans?

3.3 Evaluate the success of completed actions (identified in your previous goals or other related plans). Did the completed actions lead to improved student learning or improved program processes?

3.4 What modifications do you plan to make to your program/division in the future to improve student learning and/or program/division processes.

Admission & Records

Admissions

2.1 The Admissions assessments led to the purchase and implementation of CCCApply, the recognized CCC standardized application for admissions with clear and concise instructions. Student use has been uniform and appears to be easy for students to comprehend.

Records

2.1 Records assessments initiated student registration only through PeopleSoft. Only problem situations are handled in person. Telephone registration was discontinued.

3.3 Services for students are now available 24/7 so that GCC access is on demand.

3.4 Eventually students will be able to order and pay for transcripts online.

Assessment

3.3 An increase in new computers has allowed more efficient and effective testing.

3.4 Continuing work with IT to resolve PeopleSoft issues involving placement tests, cut score, test expiration and results.

Disabled Students Programs & Services

2.1 Meeting with focus groups revealed that faculty need more information about students with disabilities and an online information/training program was created for faculty/staff access and staff development credit. Student survey data serves as a baseline for future trends in student's effective use of accommodations. As a result of counseling stressing the importance of physical activity, there was an increase in student enrollment in PE classes.

3.3 Online training for faculty and staff began in fall 2010. Expanded DSPS courses and workshops to better meet the needs of the ever changing student population will begin in 2011-2012. Additional funding opportunities are being addressed to meet the needs of returning war veterans.

3.4 Work is being completed on an Upward Bound grant for veterans. For health and safety reasons an increase in support staff is being sought to help to lower the instructor-student ratio.

EOPS

2.1 Assessments concerning student email activation and promotion of website visits provided information regarding student reluctance to begin using this form of communication. In response, workshops, classroom presentations and homework assignments for extra points was provided to help students guidance and support. The EOPS mutual responsibility contract has been revised to include this requirement.

3.3 EOPS collaborated with other agencies to increase the use of technology and improve student services and long waits resulting in: CARE meal cards, cost savings of email versus duplicating

expenses, improved quality and recency of communications, and despite 40% cuts to programs, continue to sustain benefits to students with as little impact as possible.

3.4 Implementation of the electronic student file system, make the EOPS program admission application process fully online, develop a Q&A section online for students and develop and teach a hybrid Student Development 100 course tailored to meet student's needs not currently met by online or traditional courses.

Financial Aid

2.1 Assessments have resulted in having students file the FAFSA electronically and accessing MyGCC to monitor their financial aid status and applications being completed on a more timely basis.

3.3 Electronic filing has simplified the application process for students and increased the number of students filing. Unfortunately, staffing cannot keep up with the increase.

3.4 Additional staff has been requested. PeopleSoft queries need to be developed to establish baseline data. Ways to further streamline application processing are being explored. This will reduce the time from application to award.

Health Center

2.1 Health Center staff are committed to having students make their own health care decisions with the provision of information and resources from professional staff. A plan of action is critical to student's making their own decisions. 93% of students files included plans of action 9this was a 2% increase over an 2008 audit. No audit was performed in 2009 due to a lack of leadership.

3.3 There has been a measurable improvement in consistently providing information and resources to students. Students are taking more personal responsibility for their own health care and increasingly making their own self-care decisions by critically evaluating the implications of recommendations and resources provided by the professional staff in the Health Center.

3.4 Increase documentation of students' stated courses of action with each contact. Maintaining consistency in identifying plans of action for students seeking counseling can be improved with re-orientation of the interns and trainees each semester.

Library

Garfield Library

2.1 Assessments based on student need have resulted in librarian consultations replacing workshops. Developmental Skills lab staff indicate that having a library has improved student success.

3.3 The collection is being used and has steadily increased as well as improving the labs ability to serve students.

Library Services

2.1 The annual spring survey of library services and the Student Views survey resulted in changing the vendor for the new copier.

3.3 Implementation of LibGuides in 2011 will improve the process of composing and updating

library guides and handouts and will support students' desire to learn library skills through handouts and research guides (also in response to the spring survey)

Library Workshops

2.1 SLO data is used to evaluate and improve workshops on an ongoing basis. Scheduling changes were made to accommodate the new block schedule and the frequency of the most popular workshops is determined by demand in past semesters.

3.3 A new Introduction to the Library for New Students workshop was added in order to teach information competency skills.

Learning Center

2.1 Tutor evaluation forms provide data based on a five point scale. Although subjective, this has provided useful data. Tutor training will be improved to address deficient areas. Additions will be made to the tutor training module and more frequent meetings with tutors will help improve ratings.

3.3 The referral process has not been very successful due to low numbers of students having referrals from their instructors. Many referrals are too general or list more issues than can be addressed in one session. Tutors prefer referrals with specified issues that can be addressed in a regular 30 min. tutoring session.

3.4 Students are never turned away for not having a referral. The workshop series has also proved successful with student demand exceeding capability. Funding for workshops depends on funding from Basic Skills or Title V. Workshops also rely on instructors willing to teach them.

Student Affairs

Athletics Administration

2.1 Assessments have resulted in more proactive services including a Student Development class for student athletes. The department also offers a comprehensive student athlete orientation and eligibility workshop for all sports teams during fall and spring.

3.3 The athletic counselors push for early completion of educational plans has led to a greater number of student athletes completing their SEPs during their first year of competition and also in turn for an improvement to the number of second year student athletes who complete SEPs prior to their second year of competition.

3.4 The completion of the fourth full SLOA will enable determination if improvements are needed in academic support services such as tutoring, study hall, etc. for student athletes.

Center for Student Involvement (CSI)

2.1 Assessment has identified whether service learning has helped students in better understanding coursework and classroom lectures. Additionally it helps to gauge whether other core competencies are met through service projects coordinated by the center.

3.3 The creation of a Service Learning Governance Subcommittee has been helpful with program processes via input from students, staff, faculty and administrators. Assessment tools for specific

programs such as the effectiveness of the Volunteer Faire and a student assessment of the faire will be implemented in fall 2011.

Student Outreach Services

2.1 The data from assessments has been used to alter programs and presentations in an effort to better student learning.

3.3 An increase in staffing has allowed the office to expand and improve the relationships between the college and the local high schools through school visits, presentations, campus tours, and Shadow Day. The SOS has shifted from being primarily a recruitment office to being a department which assists students in transitioning to GCC including pre-enrollment and support while attending GCC.

3.4 SOS will continue to focus on creating stronger bonds with institutions, counselors and students who are not being served in order to assist their transition to college. A gap exists due to state budget cuts and some community colleges making drastic cuts to their outreach departments.

Scholarship Program

2.1 Assessment shows that the program goals are successful and the number of students served increases each year.

3.3 Implementation of an online application process resulted in more accurate and efficient application completion. Again the number of students who successfully applied doubled. Additionally, the process streamlined the program manager's job responsibilities resulting in more outreach efforts by the program manager.

3.4 The program will continue with on-going efforts to make more students aware of the program and take advantage of this opportunity.

Student Activities

2.1 Through student reports and surveys the effectiveness of student leader's personal growth, trainings, workshops, improvement included more extensive and in-depth campus trainings and changes in workshops provided at orientations and leadership retreats.

3.3 Improvements have included expanded ASGCC support for programs that increase student/faculty interaction outside the classroom. Student government leaders participating in statewide conferences and local rallies for advocacy and the conversion of SC212 into a L3 classroom.

3.4 Increased funding for the increasing number of student clubs and organizations, increased recruitment efforts in diversifying student representation in the ASGCC, parliamentary procedure workshops for student leaders.

Student Employment Services

2.1 Assessment identified campus employment leading to better communication skills for students and in gauging whether other core competencies are met through jobs on campus.

3.3 The completed action of placing students in jobs on campus somewhat related to their field of study has led to improved student success and program success based on the results of the SLOs.

3.4 Based on assessment, the creation of more jobs not only on campus, but also off campus would help to improve the program.

Student Services

Academic Counseling

2.1 Assessment has led to improved intake and counseling sessions, heightened awareness of the importance of students developing SEPs, and a better understanding of what is important to students in their educational planning.

3.3 The matriculation outcomes study showed improved course completion, higher GPAs, a higher rate of persistence for students, etc.

3.4 Most improvements are contingent on the return of categorical funding for Matriculation. Services have already been modified and streamlined and other improvements will need a return to base funding.

Career Center

2.1 Objective feedback comes directly from students comments and assessment results have led to improved career counseling sessions, and a greater sense of students understanding of themselves and the career decision-making process.

3.3 Students completed SEPs, narrowed down majors and chose several career options. Students deciding on their majors leads to improved student focus and grades.

3.4 Scoring of the MBTI provides immediate results to students after taking the inventory assessment. This speeds up the interpretation and an appointment for the “one stop career process”.

International Students

2.1 One trend revealed from the assessment is that students who participate in student activities and field trips find them helpful in making friends, adjusting to life in the U.S. and feeling connected to the college.

3.3 Based on students receiving critical information from the student orientation course, email messages and appointments with their counselor, these resources work in unison to help relay information to students for practical use.

3.4 Continuous discussion revolves around ensuring that students have adequate information to avoid pitfalls such as registering late and falling below full-time status and jeopardizing F-1 status. Multiple communication tools and resources are needed in communicating with students.

Transfer Center

2.1 SLO assessment focused on student’s knowledge of the transfer process and the support of the Transfer Center. Results confirmed that efforts to inform students of minimum transfer

requirements are working, however, there is a need to continue to educate students on transfer strategies such as GPA requirements.

3.3 Students are more aware of the transfer process and timelines as demonstrated by the increase in applications.

3.4 Continue to teach transfer basics (minimum requirements) and advanced strategies of how to be a competitive applicant to students.

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

- Complete SLOAC reporting via eLumen will be linked into the 2011 document on the program review website.
- Continue consulting with SLO Committee for fine-tuning questions for the SLO section of the document.
- All program review documents will be made available for programs on the PR website.
- A timeline will be prepared in advance and made available on the website.
- The PR process “the big picture” (aka diagram in the Planning Handbook) will be published on the PR website.
- Workshops will be scheduled for instruction, student service and administrative groups showing completed reports and strategies for analyzing data effectively, etc.
- An effective method for multi-program division reporting will be refined and developed.
- Specific information regarding strengths and weaknesses of the program will be added.
- A rubric and a norming packet will be developed and published for validation of program review reports.
- Pathways for forwarding resource requests for validation will be clarified and published

EXIT SURVEY RESULTS

After the completed program review documents were submitted to the Program Review Committee, the committee conducted an exit survey to assist in ascertaining strengths and weakness of the PR document and process, and to receive constructive feedback from all who participated in the process. (See Appendix X.)

Results of Program Review Survey for Instruction

Surveys were completed by 87.8% of instructional division chairs. Ninety-one percent of respondents indicated that program reviews were completed by division chairs along with input from some or all division members. Prior to this year, program reviews were submitted by individual programs; it is promising to see that, for most divisions, the new process of reporting on a division-wide basis is a viable alternative to individual program reporting. On the other hand, respondents indicated that division-wide reporting posed particular problems for divisions housing multiple departments. This issue needs to be addressed as the PR committee undertakes improvements for next year.

Approximately 93% of respondents reported that they were successfully able to interpret the data included in the Trend Analysis section, and 78.6% said that they found the data categories useful in representing division trends. Despite this, 50% of respondents indicated that they would still welcome future support (in the form of workshops on data-interpreting strategies). The PR committee is planning such workshops for the upcoming year.

Approximately 69% of respondents said that the SLO data categories adequately reflected the divisions' SLOAC progress. Comments indicated that in the future the SLO and Curriculum section should ask for data on percentages of *sections* with ongoing assessment, as opposed to percentages of *courses*. The PR committee, in consultation with the SLO committee, has begun revising this section for next year. Some chairs also noted that SLO data was not accurate, indicating that the PR process is making divisions more aware of the need for reporting SLOAC progress in a timely manner.

Seventy-seven percent of respondents reported that the section on Evaluation of Previous Goals assisted them in supporting their resource requests. Comments indicating a need for improvement in this section included that it was difficult for multiple-department divisions to complete this section, especially with disciplines are not closely related to each other. Also, some respondents mentioned that this section required them to repeat information from other sections of the report. The PR committee is currently working on ways to address both of these issues for next year.

Approximately 76% of respondents were satisfied that the section on Action Plans assisted them in supporting their resource requests. However, it was also noted that not all resource requests can be linked to campus-wide or even division-wide plans (e.g. basic supplies).

Approximately 84% of respondents said that the Resource Request section enabled them to address issues related to their resource requests. Some chairs noted the problem of redundancy in sections four and five, as well as a need to devise separate categories for resource requests

(e.g., instructional equipment, non-instructional equipment, etc.). Again, as the PR committee works of improvements for next year, both of these issues are being addressed.

Finally, regarding the new PR process overall, 84% of respondents noted that discussions and presentations prior to the launching of the new process were helpful in getting them started and also that they received above average to excellent support from the PR committee. The remaining 16% indicated that they had not needed to request support for the new process. And 87% reported that they and their divisions were knowledgeable about the new PR document and process. On the other hand, there was some dissatisfaction with the new process in relation to the accessibility/reliability of information needed to complete the report. Authors mentioned inaccuracy of data, as well as some data categories not being relevant to particular divisions, for example, those with noncredit programs.

Results of Program Survey for Student Services

Surveys were completed by 52% of student services managers. Eighty percent of respondents indicated that program reviews were completed by area managers with the help of all area employees, while 20% were completed by the area manager alone.

One hundred percent of respondents reported that data categories in the Trend Analysis section were useful in representing division trends.

One hundred percent of respondents indicated that SLO data categories adequately reflected SLOAC progress for their divisions. However, one respondent reported that much data from the division was not relevant to SLOs.

One hundred percent of respondents said that the section on Evaluation of Previous Goals helped in supporting their resource requests.

One hundred percent of respondents said that the section on Action Plans assisted them in supporting their resource requests.

One hundred percent of respondents noted that the Resource Request section enabled them to address issues relevant to support their resource requests. Some respondents added that this section was time consuming, and there was no place on the form to identify resource requests with a name.

Regarding the new PR process overall, 80% of respondents noted that discussions and presentations prior to the launching of the new process were helpful in getting them started. Sixty percent of respondents said that they received satisfactory to excellent support from the Program Review Committee. The remaining 40% indicated that they had not needed to request support for the new process. One hundred percent of respondents said that they were knowledgeable about the new program review document and process. The largest spread from respondents came in relation to whether needed information was readily available to assist in completing the report. To this question, 20% said “unsatisfactory”; 20% said “satisfactory”; 10% said “above average”; 30%

said “excellent”; 40% said “not applicable.” Unfortunately, respondents did not make comments related to these scores.

Finally, several respondents completed the Open Comments section. The comments, summarized as follows:

- The new process is too tied to budget requests, omitting crucial questions about program review, such as program improvement and weakness.
- Respondents would like samples of effectively filled out PR documents.
- Respondents would like a legend of acronyms and initialisms with the document.
- Include a place on the document where the author can identify him/herself.
- The PR process needs to indicate where resource requests come from (PR vs. Planning); also the process needs to clarify where requests will ultimately end up (standing committees, IHAC, etc.).
- Standing committees and HACS need a consistent process (rubric?) for tanking requests.



Annual Program Review 2010-2011 Instructional Programs

Division:

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be signed by the Division Chair and Dean before being submitted to the Program Review Committee.

Signature of Division Chair

Signature of Dean

Date Submitted to Program
Review Committee

Describe the relationship of your program to the college's [Mission Statement](#):

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Program	FTES Trend	FTEF Trend	WSCH / FTEF Trend	Full- Time % Trend	Fill Rate Trend	Success Rate Trend	Awards Trend

1.1. Describe how these trends affect student achievement and student learning:

1.2. Is there any other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

For each program within the division, provide the following information.

Program	% of Courses with Identified SLOs	% of Courses with Ongoing SLO Assessment	% of Courses Reviewed for Outline Changes	% of Courses Whose Prerequisites Were Validated in 2009-2010	% of Courses Whose Textbooks Were Reviewed in 2009-2010	Degree/ Certificate SLO* If your division has defined other program SLOs, please indicate below

* A program (for purposes of Degree/Certificate SLOs) is a cohesive set of courses that lead to degrees and certificates. Divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs.

2.1. Would you like to comment on your percentages outlined above?

2.2. How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning?

2.3. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

2.4. Does the student assessment data indicate overall program needs that may require support from the institution? Define these observed needs and support your answer using your assessment data.

3.0. Evaluation of Previous Goals

This section is an evaluation of program goals and activities from previous years.

3.1. List actions identified in your last program review or any other related plan(s).

3.2. What measurable outcomes were achieved due to the actions completed?

--

3.3. Evaluate the success of the completed actions. Did the completed actions lead to improved student learning or improved program/division processes?

--

3.4. What modifications do you plan to make to your program/division in the future to improve student learning and/or program/division processes?

--

4.0. Action Plans

Based on trends and student learning outcomes, describe your program plan for the next academic year. Include necessary resources.

Action	Related EMP Goals and SLOs	How action will improve student learning	Resource Needs

5.0. Resource Requests

Each resource request requires completion of the entire section (Sect. 5.0 - 5.4 on the next page).
Please copy the following page separately for each resource request.

2010 PROGRAM REVIEW

Division:

Section 5.0 Resouce Request

All resource requests should be tied to at least one of the following:

The [Educational Master Plan](#) or other related plan goal.

The [Core Competencies](#) (Institutional SLOs)

A program or course SLO

5.1. What planning goal (EMP or other plan), core competency, or course/program SLO does this resource request address?

5.2. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request? (This could be an improvement in the SLO or another measurable outcome.)

5.3. Describe the resource request in detail.

5.4. What resources are needed to fill this request? Potential funding sources might include Senate PFE funding, categorical funding sources, Perkins funding, basic skills funding, etc.

Note: All personnel requests will require the additional "IHAC Addendum" to be completed.

Type of Resource	Amount Requested	Description	Justification	Potential Funding Sources
Personnel				
Facilities				
Equipment				
Supplies				
Software				
Training				
Other				
Total				



Annual Program Review 2010-2011

Student Service Programs

Division/Service Area:

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be signed by the Division Chair and Dean before being submitted to the Program Review Committee.

Signature of Manager

Signature of Dean

Date Submitted to Program
Review Committee

Describe the relationship of your program to the college's [Mission Statement](#):

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Program: Service/Function	Acad. Year	Service Contacts	STAFFING				Other Data tbd	Other Data tbd
			FTEF	Classified	Hourly Classified	Other FTE		

1.1. Describe how these trends affect students and/or your program:

1.2. Is there any other relevant information that affects the evaluation of your program?

2.0. Student Service Learning Outcomes

For each program within the division, provide the following information.

Program: Service/Function	SAOs Written	Assessment Tool Written	Assessment Completed	Assessment Data Analyzed	Data Used For Improvement or Planning	Number of Cycles Completed

2.1. How has assessment of student service outcomes led to improvement in your program or plans?

2.2. Does the student assessment data indicate overall program needs that may require support from the institution? Define these observed needs and support your answer using your assessment data.

3.0. Evaluation of Previous Goals

This section is an evaluation of program goals and activities from previous years.

3.1. List actions identified in your last program review or any other related plans (EMP, SS SMP, IT Plan etc.)

3.2. What measurable outcomes were achieved due to the actions completed?

3.3. Evaluate the success of the completed actions. Did the completed actions lead to improved student success or program processes?

3.4. What modifications/improvements do you plan to make to your program/ based on your assessments?

4.0. Action Plans

Based on trends and student learning outcomes, describe your program plan for the next academic year. Include necessary resources.

Action	Related EMP/SS SMP Goals and SAOs	How action will improve student success and/or service functions	Resource Needs

2010 PROGRAM REVIEW

Division/
Service Area

Section 5.0 Resource Request

All resource requests should be tied to at least one of the following:

The [Educational Master Plan](#) or other related plan goal.

The [Core Competencies](#) (Institutional SLOs)

SAOs

5.1. What planning goal, core competency, or SAO does this resource request address?

5.2. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

5.3. Describe the resource request in detail.

5.4. What resources are needed to fill this request? Potential funding sources might include Senate PFE, categorical, matriculation, Perkins, Basic Skills funding, etc.

Note: All personnel requests will require the additional "IHAC Addendum" or CHAC form to be completed.

Type of Resource	Amount Requested	Description	Justification	Potential Funding Sources
Personnel				
Facilities				
Equipment				
Supplies				
Software				
Training				
Other				
Total				

2010 PROGRAM REVIEW

Resource Request Validation Form - Instructional Programs

SAMPLE

Resource Request I: SS-7 Field Trip to XXX

Requesting Program Social Sciences

Rate the strength of the relationships between this resource request and the following criteria.
Use a scale of 0 (no relationship) to 5 (very strong relationship) to score each criteria.

Criterion	Description	Score
Section 1.0	Relationship with student achievement data. Will the request lead to improved achievement in areas such as transfer rate, job placement, basic skills, completion rate, etc.?	4
Section 2.0	Relationship with SLO assessment evidence that would lead to program improvement.	4
Section 3.0	Relationship with program plans, goals and actions that would lead to improved student learning/program processes.	0
Section 4.0	Relationship with EMP goals or other campus plans that would lead to improved student learning/program processes.	4
Other criterion if provided in report	(Brief description if applicable) Continued support of successful program for students	3
TOTAL SCORE (1-5)		15
TOTAL (Average of 1-5)		3

Evaluators:
Bob Jones
Jane Doe
Mary Smith

Date: 1/5/2011



ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES PROGRAM

Department/Service Area:

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be signed by the Division Chair and Dean before being submitted to the Program Review Committee.

Department Manager

V. P. Administrative Services

Date Submitted to Program
Review Committee

Describe the relationship of your area to the college's [Mission Statement](#):

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Department Service Area/ Function	Service Provided	Contacts/ Recipients/ Production	Acad. Year 07-08	Acad. Year 08-09	Acad. Year 09-10	PERSONNEL		

1.1. Describe any **trends** and how this affects your service recipients, area or the district:

1.2. Is there any other **relevant information** that affects the evaluation of your service area?

2.0. Administrative Unit “Outcomes”

Develop one “outcome” that could benefit operations in each service area and an assessment method to determine if the outcome has been met for each service area within the department.

Department Service Area/Function	Adm. Unit Outcome Developed	How Outcome will be Assessed	Assessment Completed	Assessment Data Analyzed

2.1. How has assessment of administrative unit outcomes led to improvement in your program or plans?

2.2. Does the unit data indicate overall program needs that may require support from the institution? Define these observed needs and support your answer using your assessment data.

3.0. Evaluation of Previous Goals

This section is an evaluation of program goals and activities from previous years.

3.1. List actions identified in your last program review or any other related plans (EMP, SMP, IT Plan etc.)

3.2. What measurable outcomes were achieved due to the actions completed?

3.3. Evaluate the success of the completed actions. Did the completed actions lead to the improvement of your area, other associated processes on the campus, or to the district?

3.4. What modifications/improvements do you plan to make to your program based on your assessments?

4.0. Action Plans

Based on trends/outcomes, describe your program plans for the next academic year. Include necessary resources.

Action	Related EMP/SMP Goals and Outcomes	How action will improve unit success and/or service functions	Resource Needs

Please complete the Section 5.0 Resource Request form for each resource needed.