Accreditation Work Group Progress Form

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Thursday, August 16.

Recommendation number and topic:
Group #3 - Institutional Effectiveness/Program Review

Full recommendation text:

Related standards:
- 1.B.5 and ACCJA Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

Work group members:
- Loren Bell
- Torrance Bynum
- Bill Goodyear
- Sue Homer
- Joanne Low
- Pam Mery
- Andrea Niosi
- Minh Hoa Ta
- Fabio Saniee
- Samuel Santos
- Katryn Wiese

Provide the dates and times of all meetings held to date. For each meeting, please briefly describe the primary focus of the discussion that took place (1-2 sentences per meeting).

Thursday, July 19 9:00 – 12:00 noon
The first meeting was a joint meeting with workgroup #2. The full group reviewed the agenda and the proposed charge and was given homework to review the recommendations, read the standards, read the relevant sections of the report, look at effective models, identify resources, list activities, and work on a timeline. We then broke into two groups where group #3 reviewed the matrix and started to develop the activities needed to meet the charge of the recommendation.

Monday July 23 3:00 – 4:30 pm
With new members joining the group, we reviewed the recommendation and the work from the first meeting. The group discussed and listed desired outcomes.

Monday, July 30 3:00 – 4:30 pm
With new members joining the group, we reviewed the work from previous meetings and divided out the tasks. Criteria for each of the major tasks were listed.

Monday, August 6    3:00 – 4:30
The group reviewed the steps and the annual timeline for program review. The template, guidelines, data, dean’s form and the website were discussed. Sub work groups were given the task of work in each area with a deadline of August 13.

Monday, August 20   3:00 – 5:30
Work Group #3 worked on the annual timeline for the program review process. It also worked on the template and guidelines. In addition, the group discussed the data elements to be included in the Program Review process and the elements to be included in the dean level review. The steps for the Fall 2012 Program Review cycle were listed.

Monday, August 27   3:00 – 4:30
Work Group #3 reviewed the Program Review deliverables: template, guidelines, rubric. Wording for the rubric was revised for consistency. Members of the Program Review Committee were also present. Goal was to bring everyone up to date and to solicit input before the August 31 roll out.

Monday, September ?? 3:00 – 5:00
This meeting was postponed to September 18. The roll out has also been delayed. A Special Board Meeting to discuss and approve the new mission statement will be held on September 11. The Program Review roll out will follow approval of the mission statement. In future cycles, the mission statement would be approved earlier in the year allowing other elements of planning and program review to maintain a synchronized calendar.

Tuesday, September 18 3:00 – 5:00
The agenda for this meeting will include final review of the template, guidelines and rubric. It will also include review of a recommendation from the technology group about linking Program Review to the Perkins Grant allocation process.

Describe your plans for addressing the recommendation. Include a brief paragraph describing each activity included on your timeline along with key dates for accomplishing those activities.

Program Review Template – The PR tool will be updated to align the items with the planning process. The elements of the program review document are relevant, but language of the items have been tightened in order to bring clarity to the question being addressed. This was especially true on the SLO related items. The goal is also to put all the information in one place for easy reference of the writer and reader. In an effort to provide a stronger link to planning and budgeting, questions on maintenance of effort, growth and reduction have been included. Each unit will also be asked to rank their needs/goals as it relates to allocation of resources. Additional changes will be made as part of the annual review and evaluation of the Program Review process.

Criteria for Dean Level Comments - The open-ended template for the dean level comments has also been revised to provide more guidance and obtain standardized comments and recommendations.

Guidelines – A simple and easy to use set of guidelines will be developed to guide those completing the PR reports for their units. The goal is to obtain standardized responses. Work on the guidelines has been continuous in order to make the examples fit with the changes to the improved template.
Website – The website for PR will be developed with an eye to making PR an on-going process throughout the year. The website will be a resource. Location and format is under research at this time.

Timeline – Work in this area continues. The goal is to synchronize the PR timeline with other planning activities in the College. Group #3 and Group #2 continue to communicate and jointly develop this timeline. Research is scheduled to rollout data for PR after September 18. There has been a delay. All PR reports will be due before the end of the semester. A more detailed timeline should be in place as the data is rolled out. In addition, there is interest in developing a calendar showing the annual PR process over a three year cycle to eliminate confusion over the time period being addressed in the report.

Summarize your progress to date on carrying out the activities described above where applicable. If you have completed any of these activities, please note the date on which it was completed and append the evidence or any products relating to the activity.

Updated drafts of the Timeline, Guidelines, Template and Rubric will be distributed to the group on Wednesday, September 12. The group will be meeting on Tuesday, September 18 to review the latest templates and guidelines. Drafts have been updated several times since the start. This process has included a meeting with the Chancellor for her review and input. Meetings with other groups, such as the Enrollment Management Team, have resulted in agreed upon data sources and a better understanding of variances in reporting. This understanding will bring an improved process. This work to tighten the data should bring differences to less than 1%. For future years, a timeline of data runs will also reduce variances.

List any challenges you have encountered or anticipate facing with respect to addressing the recommendation.

A continuing challenge has been questions about the data provided in the PR template. Research gathers the information from our computer system, but the departments/units question the accuracy of the information. As stated above, meetings with Office of Instruction, Admissions and Records, and Research have resulted in agreed upon data sources and variances.

Another challenge is that we need different information/data for different types of units (i.e. instructional vs. student development vs. campuses vs. service). Research has continued to refine the data before the roll out.

As we move into a data driven decision making model, we may not be able to provide complete and accurate information to the PR units. Units with grants and contracts would benefit from data on revenue as well as expenditures. This would provide a more complete assessment.