 PROGRAM REVIEW CHECKLIST  
For School Deans and Vice Chancellors

As you review draft program reviews from your units, please refer to this checklist.
All **bolded items** are available at the program review website [www.ccsf.edu/program_review](http://www.ccsf.edu/program_review)

- All submitted reviews **must** use the **Annual Program Review Form**. No other format will be accepted.

- Questions 1 through 7 must contain substantive responses. Nothing is "not applicable" for any unit, except perhaps Question 8. If you have not already, review the **Guidelines** created to guide/facilitate complete and thoughtful responses.

  **REMINDER:** Despite passage of Props 30 and A, we must continue to scrutinize the health and viability of all areas, including identifying and proposing areas for reduction or increased efficiencies.

- For Question 1, units must refer to the revised **CCSF Mission**.

- To respond to the first half of Question 2, units **must** use data provided via these **Data Links**:
  - Department Productivity **for all units**.
  - Demographics, Success Rates, and Program Awards **for instructional units**.
  - SARS data for **counseling units**.

  **REMINDERS:** Data must be referenced in the responses; however, the Excel tables should **not** be inserted into the submitted report. (These instructions are also contained in Attachment A.)

  Units can and should be proactive in providing additional data when available and appropriate.

- Question 4 pertains to SLOs and AUOs. Administrative units should address AUOs per the instructions sent in earlier emails. (See Attachment B.)

- Units must refer to **Board Priorities** and/or **Strategic Priorities**, particularly for Questions 6 through 8. (For further instructions see Attachment A.)

- As you review Question 8, keep a copy of the **Rubric** on hand.

  A robust program review process depends upon everyone’s active engagement.

  Thank you for your efforts!
Hello Department Chairs, Program Coordinators, and Administrators,

Below are some "alerts" related to program review:

> **Department Productivity.** A new version with revised dept chair figures has been posted to the website www.ccsf.edu/program_review IMPORTANT: A "Data Notes" page has also been added. It is the first worksheet in the Excel file. If you do not see the "Data Notes" page, press the F5 key to refresh.

> **More Data Posted.** Department Demographics and Success Rates are also available at the website. In addition, Student and Employee Survey Results have been posted.

> **Data Tables.** Please use and reference the data provided by Research & Planning as you complete your program review, but please do not insert tables with the provided data directly into your Word document. Those reading the reviews (i.e. your dean or supervisor) should access the provided data via the program review website. (This does not preclude you from inserting supplemental data if you wish.)

> **Board Planning Priorities.** The Board Planning Priorities are attached to this email and are also available via the program review website. Someone noticed that they have been referred to in three different ways: (a) Board Priorities, (b) Board Planning Priorities, and (c) Board's Annual Priorities and Planning Assumptions for 2012-2014. All three refer to the same document -- sorry for any confusion! On a related note, the top of the Annual Program Review Form contains these directions: "As you complete the form, please cite linkages to Board priorities and/or Board-approved college plans." As you know, the College has many plans and it is not our intention for everyone to re-read them all. Here are three helpful hints... (a) when possible and relevant, please do cite linkages to the Board Planning Priorities (BPP) as you respond to questions 1 through 8; there are ten priorities which you can refer to as BPP 1, BPP 2, BPP 3, etc. (b) when possible and relevant, also cite linkages to the Strategic Plan (SP) -- particularly when responding to questions 6, 7, and 8; you can refer to these as SP AI, etc. (c) Other plans are somewhat less current, but a few departments may wish to cite them for very specific reasons, e.g., ITS might draw substantially from the Technology Plan; Facilities might draw substantially from the Sustainability Plan; etc.

Finally, thank you all for your attentiveness to this process. If you have questions, emailing research@ccsf.edu reaches all three of us -- Steve Spurling, Judy Seto, and me. We will continue to be as responsive as possible.

Best,
pam.
ATTACHMENT B

Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO) Guidelines

NOTE: The text below was sent from research@ccsf.edu to all relevant units on 10/31 and 11/2 (send dates vary by unit)

Clarification for Question 4. On the form which each of you complete for program review, Question 4 references "Administrative Unit Outcomes" (AUOs). While instructional SLOs have received substantial attention this fall, AUOs have not. This email provides at least minimal guidance for this year.

First, begin your response to Question 4 by broadly addressing the quality ratings for your area as indicated by the survey results [posted online at www.ccsf.edu/program_review]. Second, identify a key factor that you believe may be contributing (positively or negatively) to the rating. Frame the factor within the context of an AUO, keeping in mind that AUOs are specific statements that include measurable outcomes and reflect broader goals for your unit. Finally, after identifying the AUO, be sure that the mechanism for assessing quality/satisfaction is indicated.

Here's a sample response: Quality ratings for both research and planning in 2011 were lower than previous ratings in 2004, although not as low as in 2000. The most recent quality ratings from 2011 were 2.80 for planning and 2.95 for research; at minimum, we want to return service levels to their peak quality rating of 3.12. The Office of Research & Planning has a broad goal of "providing data for College use." A specific AUO associated with that goal is "assuring the timely availability of meaningful data for annual planning," but we believe we have fallen short on achieving this AUO. In the recent past, achievement data spanned several reports that were presented at various times and not always within contexts that allowed for healthy dialog. Given the College's planning needs, we suspect these deficiencies contributed to the lower ratings in 2011. In the coming year, Research & Planning will make a concerted effort to improve in this area by outlining a consolidated reporting template, incorporating feedback to improve the template, producing the report by a date certain to allow for timely processes, and promoting conversations about the data therein. Those who participate in the data discussions will complete a short survey indicating to what extent they understood why specific data were included, whether they agreed that the data were relevant and useful for decision-making, what improvements they would suggest for future annual reports, and whether they felt broad participation in the data discussions was encouraged.

OPTIONAL: If you would like more information about AUOs, you may wish to skim these nationally recognized guidelines: http://oeas.ucf.edu/doc/adm_assess_handbook.pdf
You may also find this link helpful. Scroll down to see the examples from other colleges:
http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/assmt/admin_examples_others.htm