Evaluation of Annual Program Review Process
Fall 2011

Q1. Please indicate your role at the college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Administrator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-DeptChair</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Classified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Please indicate your division (per the last program review cycle beginning in fall 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-AcadAffairs</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-StuDevelopment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Chancellor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Check one or both of the following if you regularly attend meetings of the College’s Planning and Budgeting Council (CPBC) or Program Review Committee (PRC):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPBC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPBC and PRC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Indicate your level participation in the program review process during fall 2010 and spring 2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Barely Involved</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Highly Involved</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY RESULTS AS OF 11/7/2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Annual Program Review Process</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Highly Involved Respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Overall usefulness of numeric data provided in the program review forms.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Ease of use of the program review forms.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Usefulness of the process, particularly with regard to eliciting unit-level reflection.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the unit level.</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the division and college-wide levels.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Usefulness of discussions, meetings, and other communications with immediate supervisor (e.g., School Dean) prior to submission of completed program review.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Usefulness of the written comments provided by the School Dean to the Program Review Committee.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Usefulness of the evaluative summary provided by the Program Review Committee subcommittee.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Those indicating 4 or 5 on the participation scale re level of involvement in program review.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS AS OF 11/7/2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>All Respondents *** Spring 2009 ***</th>
<th>All Respondents *** Fall 2011 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average to Excellent</td>
<td>Above Average to Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Overall usefulness of numeric data provided in the program review forms.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Ease of use of the program review forms.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Usefulness of the process, particularly with regard to eliciting unit-level reflection.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the unit level.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Quality of results of the process, particularly with regard to facilitating transparent and rational planning at the division and college-wide levels.</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents *** Spring 2009 ***</th>
<th>All Respondents *** Fall 2011 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13_Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the types of students who are taking our courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least, I have begun to be more involved by reading up and giving input to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials sent out by the Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being much more aware of SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better organizing and keeping more records, analyzing more data trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., unmet demand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better planning and inputs from the Dept. level and hopefully lower.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearer focus on outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Program Review to Planning and Budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating more documentation of activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to respond to questions, less time devoted to the process to reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in more effective discussions with faculty about the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure, curriculum and interactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing more on student learning outcomes and long range planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to keep goals in mind and set direction for department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider more on Student Learning Outcomes and achievable measurable goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think I am doing much differently. When it was a 5-year review,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there was considerable work, and I appreciate that the annual review is less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work all at once. There is some discussion within the dept. or between the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair and specific faculty to respond to specific parts of the annual review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form. There is annual discussion of our goals - which we had before there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was an annual program review process too. I feel like our dept. is pretty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategic and monitors data already - this process probably reinforces that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been more concerted work around SLOs in the last two years than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previously - perhaps that is tied to program review or just to accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or the academic fashion of the moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my program review to plan for my department and catalog our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishments. Simply creating the document and thinking about the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helps me to develop new ideas, plans, and motivations to keep pushing for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best our department can be. When I say we want to do something, it’s more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely that we actually will.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was assisted by review committee members who helped me through the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and offered suggestions to support my efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping more statistics, which is good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at data more carefully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on data driven decisions. Expectation of continuing data access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really doing much differently; however, the process is more streamlined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful to have some written instructions and guidelines as to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what the various data indicate, i.e., WSCH, FTE, etc., provided with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program review template, so we could make more informed judgments about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an assumption that all of us know what those figures indicate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing more workshops for students and looking more closely at student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing operations more thoroughly and implementing changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO’s and Follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs are updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program review process does not drive department operations. It requires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a certain amount of reflection, which can be useful. But many departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be doing what they’re doing with or without it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three cycles of review have provided a historical component to the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to facilitate introspection, evaluation and planning. It’s important to know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where the program was and how priorities have changed over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating SLO’s, keeping track of progress within the Dept. in more detail,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a committee designated for PR activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the supplied data more and taking this into further consideration in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected planning cycles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little. We added one class in response to community requests which.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other changes have been due to budget cuts and fiscal restraints have put</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any improvements on indefinite hold.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve had a long term plan and we are sticking to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on better utilization of SLO development &amp; evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
absolutely nothing - the program I teach in is out of date and suggestions for improvement are NOT welcome

Data provided in program review is not always correct or clear which leads departments to make certain assumptions that may not be accurate. There is not a mechanism to correct data and have the revised data show up in the data generated in Program Review data for department use or application.

Getting frustrated by the fact the program reviews are not utilized by admin in any decision making.

Much time that should have been spent with students was wasted on this make-work exercise.

Not much

Not much

Nothing

nothing

Nothing really. My department has been conducting most of its assessment w/o much help from administration or with regards to this new process.

Nothing.

similar review process annually, so even more time is taken away from classes. Completing the process every 3-4 years is much more beneficial it both time and goal setting.

This is my first time.

This was my first preparation of a Program Review so I am unable to properly answer this question.

What process.
Q14_Most Useful

Again the data about our students has been very useful
Answering questions
Assessing a couple of SLO's....because the feedback made us change the way we do certain things in our department.
At least it forces us to stop and think, and to report on workloads
Checking out the numbers.
Collaborating with Colleagues and generating and implementing new ideas for improved SLOs
Coming up with long-term goals and ranking them in conjunction with departmental staff gives some clarity as to where we would like to go some day.
Comparing college-wide data, reviewing dept. data
Dept. productivity
Discussions with chair and faculty, reviewing the departments needs, successes and plans is a useful and helpful planning process.
Discussions with colleagues
For the most part, it was very useful and easy process. It gives each department the opportunity to review itself.
Forcing reflection and focus in each department on what they are doing and why and their impact on student learning.
having the Dean collaborate in the Program Review process
I have used the reports to get information about departments and programs for which I do not have first hand knowledge. The program review reports are well organized and easy to use to find either summary information or detailed information. The reports provide reliable information that is presented with some consistency -- useful for creating a composite view of college programs.
I like that the process was computer driven.
I think keeping it annually is best to really review where we are at.
I would like the Committee to formulate survey/questionnaires and send out request for input on different topics. After its compilation, return the draft for us to continue the discussions at departmental meetings. In this way, everyone can have an easier opportunity to participate and get feedback before the Committee finalizes the report. I want to thank the Committee members who are the leaders and thinkers of the Department for their dedication and hard work in improving our services and program
It's useful to see some numbers, but it's not clear that they are accurate.
I've used the repository of program reviews on numerous occasions. The information on the web is valuable.
Just writing it up and having it available for our department was useful to bring us all together in a shared mission. Also, I enjoyed reviewing other departments' documents to gather data for more school-level initiatives that I want to push forward (but again, solo).
Keeps our planning in focus
Most useful is the dialog with the other members of the departmental committee and the reports from other department members about all the initiatives we are working
Promotion of dialog within departments and across the School.
Shorter questions
The forms were well put together and easy to use as were descriptions of the process.
The opportunity to reflect on all aspect's of the department's work.
The practical new guidelines and forms, the more involved process from the Departments.
The process allows for yearly goal planning; however, realistically, there is never enough money to see some goals through.
The process of program review requires us to stop and reflect upon our goals and progress. This is a very important process.
The process works in that it engages the though process for managers.
The shorter and more focused questionnaires. They are briefer and to the point.
The template is relatively easy to follow.
Thinking about course offerings/delivery
Use of the DSS information, quality of previous program review by previous dept. chair was very helpful.
Year to year comparison of goals and projects, need to update them.
It is not very useful as presented
n/a
None
nothing useful - only select faculty allowed to be involved

The most useful part of the process would be to get clear and consistent guidelines in a timely manner to allow time for planning in the face of competing deadlines. Unsure.
Can I trust the data as the foundation upon which the review is conducted? Components of the review can easily turn into proposals for budget increases.

Cross referencing of College documents to substantiate unit characteristics and needs. Poor budget data. Data not reflective of program; data used to make program decisions; no real change at funding/college level. Date needs to be cleaned up, more accurate.

Due to the budget crisis the college cannot be responsive to our programmatic needs. Finding time to complete the report then getting very subjective evaluation responses, which many times do not make sense, is very challenging. The people reviewing the reports do not always understand vocational education requirements, therefore their responses are not helpful.

For Administrative units, it continues to be difficult to separate unit outcomes from Administrator Evaluation objectives, especially for relatively small units with just one or two classified staff. I think the linkages between Program Review and the College's budgeting system remain tenuous at best. Having the PRC report to CPBC is a good first step, but I'm unsure that we can show clear evidence that an item a unit identified in their program review this past year found its way into the budget. The Program Review Committee has suffered from unfocused and politically weak leadership. Perhaps the imminent change in leadership will help.

Getting accurate data to reflect cross-listed courses.

Getting started in laying out the goals and objectives. Getting enough conscientious and capable people who can meet at the same time and place. Other dept members have to step up and fill in the void. Once the brainy committee designs the workplan and submit a draft, it would give the dept some basic form to work off from and give input into. Student evaluation should be emphasized as a measure of our faculty/staff performance and our program success.

Getting the numbers right.

Having it reviewed by others was INCREDiBLY DISAPiNNiNG. The comments were useless, and there's no indication that having anyone else read these will actually make the things we want to accomplish happen. We still feel solo.

I find that the numbers provided are not always accurate. I don't trust much of the data coming out of the Office of Instruction or Banner.

I hate to say it, but the long-term planning isn't very useful. Circumstances change so quickly that any plan more than, say, three years in advance seems pointless. The resources devoted to long-term planning are wasted when you cannot predict your funding/scheduling/hiring even into the next year.

I really do not understand the financial report and do not know whether it is accurate or not. My Associate Dean reviews that. It seems complicated to me the way it is organized.

I think that the general feeling that no one reads/addresses issues.

Involvement to ALL faculty - NOT just the favorites.

Lack of income data for some departments charged with providing a service to the College.

Links between unit and management levels, need for financial guidelines and financial assumptions from early on in the process, although this may have been impossible with difficult economic and budget scenario in the State.

Many gaps in program review, what is covered seems rather selective. The biggest problem is that nobody within the program has taken responsibility for ongoing updating of information, so there is a rushed scramble to collate data and fill in the blanks close to the due date. The work should be ongoing and structured so that staff have time to gather and provide information, and there's time for better writing, review and editing.

Mgm. doesn't engage us - doesn't pass on the information from Adm. regarding the process, lets us know about it a week before it's due. There isn't any budget information available, or the information is incorrect, making accurate assessment problematic.

My dean is really otherwise involved and did not offer much assistance. However, I didn't feel he could offer much.

N/A

No fiscal data provided for the 4th year in a row...especially grant data... Data provided inconsistent for time period Without complete view of total Dept. Self-study is not accurate.

Nothing was really problematic; however, we questioned some of the data....

One fits all inaccurate data... .

Only the time spent doing it.

Reviewing all the data that was submitted. Simplifying and clarifying the data is always helpful.

Since program review is supposed to be tied to budget requests, and there has been no money lately, the process is rather useless in the short haul. But it's ok to keep improving the process while we hope for better times.
Statistical data from Banner still seems a little off. Need to keep refining Banner system to get good data.

Stats given to the Department were incorrect, and it took too much time and effort to try to get accurate stats from the Research Dept.

Still do not have grant data, data related to restricted funds or a true fiscal picture of department. Entire dept. is not reflected in financial data, therefore only a part of the dept. can be reviewed. Financial data not reliable.

Student Learning Outcomes continues to be challenging.

Summary reports of the findings should be reviewed in detail by the Planning and Budging Council and also used as the basis for decisions made by the administration. For instance, in the current round of budget cuts, results from program review should be taken into account.

The annual short time frame meant no meaningful reflection could be done. If this is written every fall, then the only full semester to actually be examined is the intermediary spring term, and as anyone with basic research training knows, a single data point cannot be used to draw any conclusions. The basic idea of a program review is fine, but a 4-5 year cycle could allow for meaningful data to be gathered, analyzed, and tested. As the current model stands, I doubt it could pass peer review for an academic journal or conference. This makes the current approach a sad waste of time and money.

The application of data generated by Program Review which had previously been corrected and not changed proved challenging.

The fact that one was done one year after the previous one didn't allow for proper analysis and evaluation of previous program review.

The secretive review of the program review files and the one-sided comments are problematic. The reading committee should meet with the writer of the document to understand the input and how they 'evaluate' the data.

The statistics continue to be unreliable in some areas—not due to Research issues but due to Banner issues. Student Development continues to be an afterthought; there should be a revised form that targets Student Development and other programs that do not fit into the instructional model, including the data sheet.

There weren't any challenges, other than trying to understand what the WSCH, FTE, etc. figures indicated. As mentioned above, clear and articulate guidelines that are provided with the template would be most useful.

unsure.

We are still unclear, perhaps cynical, whether the process take our requests into full consideration, particularly with concrete budget support for our plans and programs. We thought we had an agreement that we would do a very short, concise annual review. Then more and more questions were added, and the document grew into something we did not agree to. I think it's time to balance the College's need for accountability (if that's what it is) and the departments' best use of their time. I wonder if the new biennial review will mitigate this workload issue.
A bonus question on Student Success would be helpful. Accurate fiscal data is essential!

A timeline for compiling information data and reviewing targets between program reviews would help units stay on track. A biennial process could mean an even larger lump of work close to the program review due date, and possibly lost or hard-to-find data because of the time lag between reviews.

Administrative Learning Outcomes

All should make an effort to closely connect the next cycle to the previous one. Also, school Management should give us even more concrete planning assumptions when we start each cycle (although we understand that with present state and national budget pressures, this may not be easy). For non-academic units, turn around time for specific services should be clearly stated and included in evaluation of these units' staff and administrators. Also, performance standards for quality and level of service, which are observable and describable though proven methods such as description of actual situations where service was rendered, should be established. Not only turn around time for services, but also the "how" service is rendered should be observed and recorded. Faculty and students are the real clients and "market" of these units.

All work and all services to students. Biennial is better than annual, so this change is good. I believe academic department reports should be reviewed by academic faculty, and vocational reports should be reviewed by faculty familiar with vocational education programs.

Bonus question I find useful to enhance information beneficial to program acknowledgement.

Comments from the Program Review Committee subcommittee are not helpful at all for our department. One gets the feeling that the members lack understanding of the department they reviewed. Comments were rewording of the report they read. No response from committee members to request for clarification. On the form the members were instructed to "Be sure to assess unit's introspection", it was left blank for our department. This review is total useless for us.

Continue to work on the quality of data reports. Take inventory of and revise the list of programs to be reviewed - avoid redundancies, identify opportunities to combine multiple reviews into one. Utilize the model of best practices and create opportunities for the college community to teach each other how to approach program review.

Department heads have been inundated with paperwork. Reduce the numbers of questions, and please leave out the "bonus questions."

I was very disturbed when the College PBC did not accept the PRC's recommendations at the end of last academic year. The PBC must start taking Program Review much more seriously.

Include program review reporting in the End of Year Assessment (or whatever we call it this year).

It seems rather silly to have non-academic units following the same template as academic units.

It's time to put some thought into how PR actually enhances what a department does. Reporting out on what you're already doing is not useful (your dean should already know about it), SLO charts are not useful (an actual SLO process is). I'm having trouble finding anything that's not focused on the college reviewing and judging a department's work, rather than the college supporting a department's work. It reminds me of evaluations - if you mix a professional development model with an accountability model, you can't expect much on the development side.

Keep it simple. Don't ask for us for our wish lists unless they have a good chance of having extra funds. Ask for suggestions on how to make us a "leaner" institution instead.

More open communications etc.

None. Keep up the good work.

Our Programs should all cater to students' needs: their educational goals (cert, degree, transfer and personal interest) AND to help them meet the demands of the job market. We should consult with the industries and workforce on courses to offer. Also make internship available so that students can have hands on experience and connection to potential employers. This type of vocational training programs apply for both credit and noncredit. Noncredit Instructional faculty should also hold office hours. They can participate in Committees or advising ESL students. They don't have papers to correct and hardly any prep time. The College is always asking for faculty participation on committees.

Outstanding accomplishments, or innovative or new initiatives could be highlighted, particularly if they are outcomes driven or are integrated into the SLO cycle.

Please provide financial data that reflects an entire dept's activity.

Possible question: What is your department doing to promote student equity in terms of enrollment, retention and successful completion? The question may have to be broadened to include Student development activities that promote student equity.

Provide a training for new department chairs and unit supervisors about the process. Hours of service/operation offered should be logged.
retention is NOT a good indicator - easy teachers keep students - those who try to challenge students have low enrollments many faculty do not give required finals or follow the course outline there are NO standards in my department

The information should be directly sent to dept. managers, budget chairs and classified supervisors.

The next program review absolutely has to have a section that will allow detail in documenting the spring 2012 program reductions that were rolled over from spring 2010, AND AND AND the disastrous effects additional reductions are having on programs that affect our students. This is where the department heads for example can provide detailed information. The results of this absolutely have to be reviewed and commented on.

The number of workshops given could be included....(non-academic units)....

This new Biennial Program Review process has proven to be useful in forcing a department to reflect carefully on what is has done, is planning to do and how to accomplish the tasks. It allows reflection on the steps to completion of departmental plans.

We may have some changes "mandated" if some of the current "reform" State recommendations go into place. Our Program Review vehicle should remain flexible enough to handle anything.