SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Institutional Program Review Committee

IPRC Handbook

Academic Program Review (APR)
Student Services Program Review (SSPR)
Academic Administrative Unit Program Review (AdAPR)
Budget& Financial Affairs/Human Resources & Superintendent/President Unit Program Review (BFA/HR/SPPR)

Approved by IPRC:
08/23/12

SWC Program Review Handbook
Table of Contents

Program Review Handbook

Introduction:

Background:
Institutional Program Review has been part of the Southwestern College culture for over two decades. The purpose of program review is to examine programs/units for institutional effectiveness, integrated planning, viability, and relevancy to the College Mission, Vision and Values as well as to the SWC Strategic Plan.

Initiated as "Achieving Institutional Mission" Task Force (or AIM for short) in 1999, the Institutional Program Review Committee (or IPRC as it is known today) has crafted an effective program review model based upon several years of reviewing and assessing a myriad of models. The AIM taskforce and the current IPRC settled upon the processes embodied in the attached historical document (Appendix D).

Several factors contributed to the inconsistent implementation of the program review model in the past, especially in the areas of Administrative and Student Affairs units; however, the College has successfully made substantial changes in its internal processes that now support and sustain an integrated program review cycle.

In preparation for the Accreditation Self-Evaluation Report, it is imperative that institutional program review be fully integrated into all college planning and budgetary processes. To that end, the principles embodied in the original AIM document have been adopted as the basis for this official College District model for implementation of institutional program review throughout all units – Academic, Administrative and Student Affairs: the Program Review Handbook.

The Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC), a standing committee of the Shared Consultation Council (SCC), has been established to serve as the overall monitor of this important process, and to ensure that the relevant information from the various program reviews were routed to the appropriate SCC standing committee for integration into our College's institutional plans (e.g., Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Educational and Facilities Master Plan, etc.).

Purpose of Program Review:

The purpose of SWC's program review process is to review, analyze, and assess the content, currency, direction, and quality of all programs and services in order to invest in the unit's future.

The intent of the program review process is to promote student-centered educational and service excellence by engaging all college units in self-examination and self-improvement.

The review process is to be broad-based, accessible, and integrated into other college -wide processes, such as accreditation, budget, and planning. The college at large is to be informed of the progress made by the various units undergoing review through several venues (e.g., Sharepoint, web site, public folders, etc.)

The information gathered and analyzed in program review is an integral part in planning, decision making, personnel development, program improvement, and optimal utilization of the college's budgetary resources.

Each unit's final report should be designed to give insight into the past, present and future through the following three broad questions
- Where has the program or service been?
- Where is it now?
- Where should it go from here?

Specifically, each unit's program review will:

- Ensure that all college programs and services are functioning in support of the college's student-centered mission.
- Promote steady improvement in the quality and currency of all college programs and services.
- Provide a body of evidence of institutional effectiveness at all levels for accreditation.
- Support the integration of the College Mission in all programs and services
- Facilitate self-analysis of each unit's functions and its relationship to college goals and the internal and external conditions that impact its operation.
- Note areas of strength and acknowledge accomplishments.
- Note areas in need of improvement to alert the college to concerns/issues in time for proactive solutions.
- Provide a vehicle for information-based, timely, collegial consultation for budget consideration to support development and improvement of all college programs and services.

Program Review Procedures and Annual Cycles:
There are four Program Review areas, which are outlined below. Please refer to the Program Review website for all forms, an electronic version of this handbook and all other related program review documents (http://www.swccd.edu/3rdLevel/index.asp?L2=535).

Academic Program Review:
Academic Program Review (or APR) follows a three-year cycle. The first year is an in-depth (or "Comprehensive") review of data and curriculum while the second and third years are for an abbreviated update (or "Snapshot") of action items and documents. Each academic discipline will undertake a comprehensive self-study once every three years on a cycle established and approved by the Academic Program Review Committee. See Appendix A for Academic Program Review schedules.

<u>Student Services Program Review</u>:
Student Services Program Review (or SSPR) process follows a six-year cycle, with all programs and services undergoing review every five years, with snapshots required annually to allow for integration into prioritization and funding as well as review and update of the process. See Appendix B for Student Services Program Review schedules.

<u>The Administrative Program Review</u>:
There are two Administrative Unit Program Reviews: these are the Academic Administrative Program Review (the AdAPR) and the Budget & Finances/Human Resources/Superintendent/President Program Review (the BFA/HR/SP Program Review). The Superintendent/President sends program reviews into the prioritization process through the BFA/HR Division. The Administrative Program Review process also follows a six-year cycle, with snapshots required annually to allow for integration into prioritization and funding as well as review and update of the process. See Appendix C for Administrative Program Review schedules.

For all program review areas, only extraordinary circumstances, events, or significant changes in the discipline, program, unit or service will be considered for adjustments in the timeline by the IPRC. State and/or federal assessments may be required more frequently for some programs and services. Additionally, significant changes in a discipline, program, unit or service may necessitate an earlier review than previously scheduled.

Comprehensive Program Reviews:
The components that comprise a unit's program review generally include the following:

- <u>Statistical data</u> that describe the program/unit in terms of student contact, learning outcomes and staff assigned to the unit.

- <u>Survey results</u> that indicate customers' degree of satisfaction with the program or service, learning outcomes and suggestions for improvement.

- A <u>comprehensive self-study</u> of the program/unit that addresses its long-term goals, functions and services; an evaluation of the data and survey results; and its response to a number of specific criteria*. The self-study should also include recommendations for improvement as well as a work plan that outlines resources required for implementation.

- An <u>Outcomes, Data & Evidence Sheet</u> which provides a summary of the most significant outcome, data and evidence used for discipline/unit changes to the discipline/unit and which supports the program review request(s).

- An <u>executive summary</u> that lists the names and signatures of all required personnel and highlights the major findings of the self-study. The executive summary will provide the basis for AIM's annual summary report to the CLC and the Governing Board.

- A <u>review form</u>, signed by the appropriate reporting entity, indicating that all criteria have been adequately addressed.

*Note: Please refer to the specific guidelines on each comprehensive Program Review for additional details regarding the specific components of Academic, Administrative, and Student Services units.

Snapshots:

The components that comprise a unit's Snapshot program review generally include the following:

- A Summary Program/Unit Action Plan updated for the current academic year.

- An Outcomes, Data & Evidence Sheet

- Requests for specific needs for each of the following areas:
  - New Equipment (over $5,000)
  - Supplies/Minor Equipment (under $4,999)
  - Facilities
  - Human Resources
  - Over-Arching Institutional Needs
  - Technology*

*Note: All Technology Requests must also have a Technology Addendum submitted with each technology request, one addendum per request. Please refer to the Program Review web site for specific details regarding this addendum.

Prioritization & Funding

Program reviews will serve as a basis for annual prioritization, funding and budget planning. Each program/unit will submit the completed program reviews/snapshots to the appropriate entity as identified in Table 1 to be incorporated into the college's annual budget process.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) shall maintain copies of all program review reports as a permanent archive and will provide data as needed for all program review reports.

The Prioritization Process:

Discipline/Unit Level:
Each discipline/unit completes either a Comprehensive or Snapshot program review for the academic year as assigned as well as an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet. These program reviews are then integrated into the program review of the next higher administrative level (e.g. School Dean or Unit Director level), who then incorporates the needs from the disciplines/units into his/her program review as well as the Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet.

School Dean/Director Level:
The School Dean/Director program reviews are then sent to their respective Vice President and are integrated into the Vice President's program review for their area, or Division (e.g. Academic Affairs or Student Affairs) along with an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet. A similar process

occurs within the divisions of Human Resources (HR) and Business and Fiscal Affairs (BFA) as well as Superintendent/President's (SP) area. At each program review level, the cumulative needs are compiled and prioritized in seven categories:

- Equipment
- Supplies/Minor Equipment
- Classified and Administrative position needs*
- Facilities
- Other Over-Arching Unfunded Needs
- Technology

*Note: All Faculty requests are prioritized separately by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization (FHP) Committee and are submitted by the FHP Co-Chairs to the SCC Co-Chairs for inclusion in the institutional prioritization process.

Division Level:

This process will result in five Division Program Review snapshots, one for each of the four Divisions and one from the Superintendent/President's area, each with an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet. These five program review snapshots include all of the needs identified in the program reviews submitted by the units within their division/area and should reflect at the very least the top 20 items. The Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet will provide data on which to base prioritization decisions. The needs in each category are to be listed in priority order, (e.g., from 1 to 20). All other items that are not prioritized in the top 20 are listed as "un-prioritized requests".

Each program review section is then separated out by type of need (e.g., Technology, personnel, facility request, equipment, supplies/minor equipment, etc) and requesting area (Division). Once compiled for the committees, the lists will be provided to the four SCC standing committees that prioritize these needs.

Institutional Level:

The following SCC Standing Committees are charged with prioritization of the following Program Review requests:

SCC Standing Committee:	Program Review Prioritization Items:
EP/EMC: Educational Planning & Enrollment Management Committee	• Supplies/Minor Equipment (Under $4,999) • Over-Arching Institutional Need
HRC: Human Resources Committee	• New Classified Positions • New Administrator Positions
IFC: Institutional Facilities Committee	• Facilities needs • Equipment (greater than $5,000)
ITC: Institutional Technology Committee	• Technology needs

Each of these committees is charged with the responsibility of developing prioritized lists of institutional needs based on program reviews submitted in that academic year.

As per the SCC Operating Principles, each of these Standing Committees must be co-chaired by an Administrator or his/her designee and one non-administrative member (Classified or Faculty member) selected by the members of the committee. Membership of each standing committee consists of either five or six faculty, administrators, classified, one confidentials representative, a SCEA rep and up to five or six students, as specified on each Standing Committee Template. Please refer to the Shared Planning & Decision-Making (SPDM) Handbook for these templates, which can be found on the SCC website (http://www.swccd.edu/3rdLevel/index.asp?L2=521).

The Top 20 List:

Ultimately, there are six areas in a Program Review that are compiled. These six areas will be result in eight prioritized lists of needs via an integrated planning process. Human Resources personnel needs are divided into Administrative and Classified personnel needs, which become lists six and seven. In addition to this seventh list, the FHP Committee separately develops a prioritized list of faculty position requests using the established FHP process; thus, the FHP list becomes the eighth prioritization category and is included in the final SCC prioritization process. The FHP List and the Technology List are to be considered "sacred", which is to say that no item can be prioritized in a different order than the ranking in which it was sent. Administrative and Classified position lists are sent to Cabinet for review; Cabinet's recommendations will accompany the requests to the HRC.

The SCC standing committees begin meeting in mid February to establish guidelines, criteria and/or rubrics for their committee's prioritization process in preparation for the initiation of the prioritization process around March 1. Each SCC standing committee shall discuss the process and develop the method/rubric for their prioritization process. The standing committees may use the VPs/SP's ranked lists and/or Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet as a guide but they are also provided the latitude to refer to any discipline's/unit's program review for more detailed information. In most cases, items considered for prioritization have come entirely from the prioritized lists submitted by the VPs/SP in their snapshot program reviews, but this is not required. For example, when developing the priority list in accordance for Technology needs, the ITC in collaboration with the ATC uses the VP/SP lists for information purposes, but also went back to the original program reviews that were submitted for further rationale and/or need assessment and also based some recommendations on the institutional Technology Plan.

Standing committees are required to complete the prioritization process no later than the specified date by the IPRC, which is usually in late March.

Prioritized lists for each category of needs in the VP and S/P Program Reviews will be provided to the respective committee membership either in hard copy form (notebooks) or in an electronic file(s) for their use in the prioritization process along with an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet to help guide their prioritization process. In addition, the individual discipline/unit program reviews will be made available to them via electronic means, e.g. Blackboard, Sharepoint or Public Folders.

The SCC Co-Chairs arrange for two prioritization sessions in a room with computer access; it has traditionally been done in the Library Classroom when available. Once all prioritization lists are ready for the SCC to prioritize, SCC members meet in the computer lab and receive brief instructions on how to prioritize. They are also provided Outcome Data & Evidence Sheets as well as other pertinent materials that may guide their decision-making based on data.

Every year, the SCC Co-Chairs will determine how many needs are to be ranked by each SCC member prior to the actual prioritization process. For example, last year, SCC members ranked the top eighty of the 153 items by assigning the score 1-80. The SCC members then individually rank the top items on all eight lists on an electronic file and email their scores to a specified person, who will be in charge of tallying scores and who will develop a final prioritized SCC Master List.

After the SCC reviews the final prioritization list (the "Master List") and approves it, the Master List will be separated into "On-Going" and "One-Time" Cost Lists maintaining the ranking on the SCC Master List. These two lists will then be forwarded to Budget Committee for funding. The SCC Co-chairs will keep the SCC informed on the funding decisions on an on-going basis.

Once an item is approved and funding source is identified by the Budget Committee, it then becomes the responsibility of the Division Vice President to ensure that a purchase order is submitted on the requisition of the request in a timely manner.

The SCC Master List will stay in effect until such time as there is a new SCC Master List or until such time that there is no further funding for item from the academic year.

Every spring, the following year's deadlines and rotations are announced before April and the program review process begins again.

Table 1
Program Review Timeline and Process

Timeline:	Process Summary:
Early Spring	• The IPRC and each respective Program Review Chair notifies the respective program review committees and units of the program review deadlines and comprehensive/snapshot rotation. • Units assemble a program review team, identifying a lead person and a committee. • Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) works with units to develop survey instrument and to determine whether additional qualitative or quantitative research is needed as well as other research needs. • Units notify their respective program review committee chair if external review is also being required by outside agency, i.e., Board of Registered Nursing, Matriculation, etc. The program review chair examines the content of the external review vis-à-vis the SWC Program Review process and then notifies the unit as to whether the external review will meet any portion of the Program Review requirements. Snapshots may still be required if there are institutional requests to be submitted for the prioritization process.
Spring/ Summer	• OIE conducts surveys and assembles standard data.
Early August/ September	• OIE provides standard statistical information and/or survey results to all units.
November 1st	• Discipline/Unit levels complete a Comprehensive or Snapshot Program Review self-study report as assigned, securing signatures of committee members and submitting final report to their School Dean/Director for review, signature and incorporation into the Dean/Director program review report. School Dean/Director reviews the self-study report, makes any comments in the comments sections, signs off on report before submittal
December 1st	• School Dean/Director reviews the self-study report and includes program review requests in his/her snapshot, which is then submitted to the respective Vice President.
December 15th	• The Vice President reviews all self-study reports in the Division for accuracy, completeness, signatures, and then incorporates program review requests into the Vice President (Division) snapshot.
January 31st	• The Vice Presidents & the Superintendent/President submit their Snapshots to their respective Program Review Chairs, who in turn submit them to the IPRC Co-Chairs.
February 1st	• Division Snapshots are compiled by respective sections for each Division and then prepared for the SCC Standing Committees in charge of prioritization as per the chart on page 6 of this document.
March 1st	• Standing Committees are sent their respective portions for prioritization. Prioritization is done by each standing committee as per the Program Review Handbook procedures.
Late March	• Prioritized lists are submitted to the IPRC Co-chairs, which are then incorporated into the SCC prioritization document by need.
April	• SCC ranks prioritized program review requests from each of the institutional program review sections.
May	• SCC prioritization results are ranked into a Prioritization Master List, which are then separated into One-Time and On-Going Lists and submitted to Budget Committee for funding.