Capacity Building for Educational Excellence through Program Review and Integrated Institutional Planning.
ACCJC Regional Workshop. Sept. 21, 2012 at Santa Rosa Junior College.
Informal, selective notes – Karen Saginor
If you’d like copies of the slides and handouts, please write to ksaginor@ccsf.edu

Charles Meng. Introductory remarks:
The foundation of effective planning is good data.

Susan Clifford and Jack Pond, ACCJC Vice Presidents
They recommend the online Accreditation Basics course and told us that in our region, 1,200 persons have completed it – 460 of those at City College of San Francisco.

Clifford and Pond reviewed:
• Purposes of Accreditation
• Sources of ACCJC’s Authority

Elements of Effective Program Review for Integrated Planning and Institutional Improvement.
Notice the cyclical nature of this process, comparative to the cyclical nature of SLO assessment.

There are two kinds of outcomes:
• Student Achievement Outcomes (such as retention rates, transfer rates, etc.)
  ⇒ Federal Government asked Accreditors to set goals, Accrreditors responded that institutions should set these.
• Student Learning Outcome, the development of skills, knowledge, or attitudes.
Cycle of assessment, analysis of outcomes, identification of gaps, design of program changes, and (re)allocation of needed resources.

Brad Philips of IEBC, Institute for Evidence-Based Change. IEBC Transitions
IEBC facilitates collaboration among primary, secondary and post-secondary institutions on a regional basis, collects actionable data and reports on student transition and success locally and statewide, engages educational leaders and faculty across segments in instructional conversations, and focuses on better curriculum alignment between secondary and post-secondary education.

If you want to make change in student behavior, you have to change faculty behavior, it’s important to empower faculty – they are the ones working with students.
Just having the data doesn’t count, you have to be able to use it, you have to have easy access to it and tell stories with it.

For Improved Student Success, the three legs of the stool are:
- Analytics – quality of data
- Human Judgment and Behavior – how it looks and how humans absorb it.
- Organizational Behavior
  ⇒ We want to create communities of courageous conversations about data. Putting into your daily work life discussions of data, as a recursive activity.

OLAP – online analytical processing.
Demonstrated the In-SITES Tool (Instant Strategic Information Tracking Educational Success)

Mary Kay Rudolph. Integrated Planning and Program Review at Santa Rosa JC
Discussed Santa Rosa’s timeline, including role of multi-constituent group to evaluate process and software tools (PRPP) for improvement. Shared governance groups play significant roles in the process. Institutional Planning Council is co-chaired by the Superintendent/President or designee and the Academic Senate President or designee. Also in review and prioritization process, Academic Senate group does it’s own evaluation in parallel with administration at some stage. Use an explicit list of criteria for program review. SLO criteria now emphasized in Santa Rosa’s program review.

Using Share Point (Microsoft product) SLO tracking systems – allows simple data entry and storage for all assessments separate form PRPP
At Santa Rosa, they look at data every year, but write narratives only every third year.
Molly Senecal and Christopher Howertown

Multi-Campus Model for Program Review and Integrated Institutional Planning: Yuba Community College District

The process has evolved from free-form, to use of templates, to use of TracDat (a commercial web-based software) to track their SLO information.

Departments fill in forms online. Challenges in alignment by changing dates and deadlines, taking feedback, and integration. A new development in the process for Yuba is the creation of a “Validation Committee Review,” a multiple constituent committee that looks at the program review between the initial submission and the final revisions and submissions.

Yuba District started their SLO work at the institutional level, with eight competencies: Communication, Computation, Critical Thinking, Global Awareness, Informational Competency, Personal/Social Responsibility, Scientific Awareness, & Technology Awareness. At Woodland CC, the SLO committee reports to both the Academic Senate and their College Council. Their motto in work with the faculty is “SLO is our puppy.” We adopted it, it’s messy and first and requires a lot of attention, but it will grow up to be our guard dog and protect us.

Sharing of practices with other participants in break-out groups.

Colleges in my group were Santa Rosa, Yuba, Napa Valley College of the Redwoods. I asked how cuts were done at their colleges. All said they’ve not had real data-driven cuts, all had across the board cuts – modified somewhat by college priorities and politics, (i.e. trustee with link to theater dept.) At Napa Valley, Program Reviews are scored by mix of administration and faculty according to rubrics to prioritize requests and allocate resources. At College of the Redwoods, the Program Review Committee that makes decisions about programs include faculty and classified as well as administrators.

SLO software used:
Santa Rosa – Share Point
Yuba – Tracdat
Napa Valley – Tracdat used for both SLOs and program review
College of the Redwoods – homegrown system. Contact Angelina Hill

Plenary discussion and summarizing

Strengths and goals of successful systems are that they are inclusive, data driven, with tracked SLOs. Accountability should be built into the system. Different models are successful in different places, but generally keeping it simple works better. It’s okay to try something, realize it doesn’t work and change it. Policies for program discontinuance should be vetted through shared governance and data driven. It’s important to stay focused on the experience of students. It is important to ask if SLO data and assessment leads to programmatic changes. It’s advisable for colleges to set two benchmarks – one that is doable, and one that is a stretch.

Ideas from other colleges that sound promising include funding tied to scoring, also tying funding to the quality of program review and how well it links to mission. Conduct a college-wide survey about the program review process and be willing to change it to make it better.

Difficulties to avoid include inadequate reporting back from the decision makers to those who prepare and submit program reviews, not taking program review seriously enough and resource allocation depending on “who was the last person in the President’s office.”

Data challenges include the experience that data is changing even as it is being collected, it’s be a moving target – the reason for CCSF’s “Looking at last year to plan for next year.” Faculty need to be able to trust the data. At one college, TracDat was implemented at great expense, but they didn’t have the resources to make it work – TracDat is not intuitive.

Program Review is never finished, expect to always be making changes and tweaks to improve the process and the outcomes. Mantra should be: collect data, evaluate, and then improve. ACCJC want colleges to be able to focus more on outcomes and less on processes.