Institutional Program Review Committee

IPRC Handbook

May 14, 2014

Table of contents

Institutional Program Review Handbook
IPRC Handbook

Historical Overview of Program Review at SWC

Institutional Program Review has been part of the Southwestern College culture for more than 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 in 1991 as "Achieving Institutional Mission" Task Force (AIM), the Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC) has crafted an effective program review model based upon several years of reviewing and assessing a myriad of models. The AIM taskforce settled upon the processes embodied in the attached historical document (Appendix **A**), which the IPRC has also adopted and adapted to the 21st century.

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 fully support and sustain an integrated program review.

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 spirit and principles embodied in the original AIM document have been adopted as the basis for this official College District Institutional Program Review Handbook, which is implemented across all institutional program review units and divisions: Academic Disciplines, Academic Administrative Units, Student Affairs units and Business and Financial Affairs/Human Resource/Superintendent-President Units.

The IPRC

The Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC), a standing committee of the Shared Consultation Council (SCC), is charged with the oversight of the institutional program review process, and to ensure that the relevant information from the various program reviews are routed to the appropriate SCC standing committee for integration into our College's institutional plans (e.g., Mission Statement, Strategic Plan, Technology Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Educational and Facilities Master Plan, etc.).

The purpose of the institutional 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 education and service excellence by engaging all college units in self-examination and self-improvement.

The Shared Planning and Decision-Making (SPDM) Handbook outlines the mission, charge, scope, membership and responsibilities of the IPRC. An excerpt is included to show the

membership. The IPRC uses operating procedures which are based on the SCC's operating procedures.

IPRC Membership

Chair/Co-Chairs	Administrative: *Director of Institutional Research, Planning & Grants* (Non Voting member) Non-Administrative: *IPROC Coordinator* (Voting Member)	
Recorder:	*Administrative Secretary II*	
Additional Office & Support Staff	*Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Administrative Secretary II*	
Voting Members		
Constituent Group	# of Reps	Specific Position of Representative(s)
Administration	3	*Three other Administrative representatives appointed by the respective Division VP*
Academic Senate	3	*IPROC Coordinator, and 2 Faculty members*
CSEA	3	*CSEA President or designated representative and 2 classified staff*
ASO	1	*ASO President or designee*

Program Review Documents

Program review requires either the Annual Snapshot or a Comprehensive report. These documents can be found on either of the following two locations:

Institutional Program Review website:
> http://www.swccd.edu/index.aspx?page=1500

The IPRC website provides an overview of the process, templates for each Division as well as electronic version of this IPRC handbook for easy reference.

On the website, you will see a tab on the left-hand side titled "Data Resources." This is where you will find links to many reliable sources of data for program review purposes, such as Data Dashboard, DataMart, Scorecard, Campus Climate surveys, Student Satisfaction Surveys, External and Internal scans, and much more.

SharePoint:
> https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/IPRC/SitePages/CommitteeHome.aspx

The IPRC has developed two shared libraries on its SharePoint site to make it easier for faculty and staff to locate IPRC documents as well as their own or other program review documents in SharePoint:

- **Standardized Document Library**: (located at the upper right hand corner of the site) https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/IPRC/Standardized%20Document%20Library/Forms/StandardDocumentView.aspx
  The Standardized Document Library contains the IPRC Committee meeting agendas, minutes, flyers, templates, general program review documents and other committee related items.

- **Program Review Shared Document Library**: (just beneath the Standardized Library) https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/IPRC/Program%20Review%20Shared%20Documents%20Library/Forms/AllItems.aspx
  The Program Review Shared Document Library contains all Comprehensive and Snapshot documents from all units, including the Division Snapshots, as well as prioritization lists, Top 20+ lists and the Master Prioritization List.

  Designators
  The Program Review Shared Document Library can be searched for a specific discipline or unit. Searches can be by year, by type of program review document (Comprehensive or Snapshot), by Division, or by designator. For program review and tracking purposes, each program and unit on campus has been assigned a unique designator, under which its documents are posted. For example, if one were searching for Accounting, one could search using the designator "ACCT."

  For a complete list of designators and instructions on how to use the Program Review Shared Document Library, please see Appendix **B**.

Program Review Procedures

The program review process is to be broad-based, transparent, and integrated into other College District-wide processes, such as prioritization of resources, budget planning, accreditation, strategic planning, and other institutional planning processes. The College District is to be provided with clear, transparent information regarding the progress made by the various units undergoing review through several venues (e.g., IPRC website, IPRC SharePoint page, 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 comprehensive program review report is designed to give insight into the past, present and future through the following three broad questions:
- **Where has the program/unit been?**
- **Where is the program/unit now?**
- **Where should the program/unit go from here?**

In addition, program review questions have been designed and updated to provide more complete responses to accreditation self-evaluation sections regarding program needs, program improvement, student needs and success as well as sustainable, continuous improvement.

Snapshot vs. Comprehensive
There are two types of Program Review documents: the Annual Snapshot (a brief update) and the Comprehensive (a deeper more involved review of your program or service). To find out which program review document your discipline or unit is required to submit and to see the Program Review Deadlines, please check the IPRC website or SharePoint site. For more

detailed information about either the Snapshot or the Comprehensive review, please refer to the relevant section found further in this handbook.

Divisions: There are four (4) Program Review Divisions, each one relating to each Division (Vice President) on campus and each submitted by IPRC-approved program review deadlines.

- **Academic Affairs Administrative Program Review (AAPR)**:
  The Academic Affairs Administrative Program Review process also falls under the Academic Affairs Division covering the non-instructional side of the Division. Most AAPRs are Level 3 (L3); only two AAPRs are Level 4 b (L4b). Unlike APR, AAPR follows a six-year cycle. In the first year of the cycle, a Comprehensive program review, which provides an in-depth update on unit goals, administrative unit outcomes (AUOs or SLOs) and the institutional program review process as a whole, is required while the other five years require only a Snapshot of action items and allocation resource requests for integration into the prioritization process. Each AAPR unit will undertake a Comprehensive once every six years on a cycle established and approved by the Academic Affairs Administrative Program Review Committee (AAPRC), a committee chaired by the Division Chair for AAPR. See Appendix **B** for AAPR cycle and other documents.

- **Academic Program Review (APR)**:
  Academic Program Review falls under Academic Affairs Division and covers all academic disciplines. APRs are considered Level 4a (L4a) and follow a three-year program review cycle. In the first year of the cycle, a Comprehensive program review is required while the second and third year require only a Snapshot of action items and allocation resource requests for integration into the prioritization process. Each academic discipline will undertake a Comprehensive once every three years on a cycle established and approved by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate. See Appendix **C** for APR cycle and other documents.

- **Business and Financial Affairs/Human Resources/Superintendent-President Program Review (BFAHRSPPR)**:
  The Business & Financial Affairs/Human Resources/Superintendent/President Program Review process umbrellas all operational units that fall under the Business & Financial Affairs Division as well as the Human Resources Division. A few BFAHRSPPRs are Level 4b (L4b) while the majority of BFAHRSPPRs are Level 3 (L3) or Level 2 (L2). BFAHRSPPR reviews under this area also follow a six year program review cycle with an additional program review submitted by the Superintendent/President providing a program review. Annual Snapshots are required by all units to allow for integration into prioritization and for funding as well as review and update of unit goals, administrative unit outcomes (AUOs/SLOs) and the institutional program review process as a whole. See Appendix **D** for BFAHRSPPR Program Review cycles and other documents.

- **Student Affairs Program Review (SAPR)**:
  SAPR falls under the Student Affairs Division. Like the other administrative divisions, the Student Affairs Program Review process also follows a six-year program review cycle. A few SAPRs are Level 4b (L4b); the majority of SAPRs are Level 3 (L3) or Level 2 (L2). All SAPR programs and services do a Comprehensive review once every six years, with annual

Snapshots required by all other units to allow for integration into prioritization. See Appendix **E** for SAPR Program Review cycles and other documents.

Exceptions for Program Review cycles: For all program review divisions, only valid extraordinary circumstances, events, or significant changes in the discipline, program, unit or service will be considered for adjustments in the timeline by the Division Program Review Committees and by the by the IPRC. State and/or federal program reviews or assessments may be required more frequently for some programs, such as CTE programs, and other services. Additionally, significant changes in a discipline, program, unit or service may necessitate an earlier Comprehensive review than scheduled.

Allocation of Resources through Program Review: Every program/unit is given an annual opportunity to request funding for new items it needs to maintain its program's integrity or for the increased funding of budget development items or replacement items. The resource allocation process is addressed through use of the Annual Snapshot. Needs of every program/unit are placed in the respective category and are incorporated into the prioritization process as outlined in the next section of this handbook. Needs incorporated into the prioritization process do not include "wish list items" but rather only those needed for sustainable continuous improvement.

Prioritization Rubrics: In order to maintain an equitable standard when prioritizing, the SCC Standing Committees responsible for completing prioritization have developed rubrics. These are used as guides for deciding which requests will be prioritized and which will not. Anyone desiring funding should be familiar with the rubrics in order to better address the items that the committee shall consider when prioritizing. Please see the section on Prioritization Rubrics towards the end of this document for a listing of the Standing Committee Rubrics. These will also be posted on the IPRC website and Sharepoint for easy reference.

Prioritization & Funding Process

Overview of Prioritization:

Program review Comprehensives and Snapshots are written and submitted to the next level for integration into the Comprehensive and Snapshot of the administrator or supervisor, who then incorporates those discipline or unit needs into his/her program review Comprehensive or Snapshot.

At each program review level, **there are eight (8) categories for resource allocation**. These are outlined below:

1. Major Equipment (over $5,000)
2. New Technology*
3. Facilities (*not included in bond projects or planned renovations*)
4. Over-Arching Institutional Needs
5. Human Resources requests for Classified Professionals/Confidentials/Administrators
6. Human Resources requests for Faculty **
7. Minor Equipment (under $4,999)
8. Replacement Technology*

Only the first three categories are prioritized by an SCC Standing Committee and then prioritized by the SCC; the other categories are either done by a specific committee (e.g., FHP) or by Cabinet. Over-Arching Needs are prioritized by the EP/EMC and then forwarded to Cabinet for final action.

*Please note: There are two separate lists: one for new Technology requests and one for Replacement Technology or upgrades. Requests for multiple items can be "bundled" into one technology request; however, only reasonable bundles will be considered for prioritization.

**Please note: All Faculty requests must be clearly included on the annual Snapshot in order to be considered for prioritization by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization (FHP) Committee, a committee comprised of faculty and administrators which follows the FHP process, a mutually agreed-to process between the Academic Senate and the SWC District.

Prioritization Begins at Level 4 and Rises to Level 1:

Levels 4a and 4b: Discipline/Unit Level
Each Level 4 discipline/unit completes either a Comprehensive or Snapshot program review for the academic year. 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.

Levels 2 & 3: Directors & School/Center Deans
School Deans and Directors must work closely in order to coordinate their program review efforts and meet with the required deadline of December 15. Once completed, School Dean/Director program reviews are then forwarded to their respective Division Vice President and are integrated into the Vice President's overall program review for their area, or Division (e.g. AAPR, SAPR, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs or BFA/HR/SPPR) along with an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet. A similar process occurs within the divisions of Human Resources (HR) and Business and Financial Affairs (BFA) as well as Superintendent/President's (SP) area.

Level 1: Division Level (Vice Presidents and the Superintendent/President.
This is the highest level of prioritization at SWC. The institutional program review process results in five Division Program Review snapshots, one for each of the four Vice President (Level 1) Divisions and one from the Superintendent/President's area, each with an Outcome, Data and Evidence Sheet. These five Program Review Comprehensives or Snapshots include all of the needs identified in the program reviews submitted by the programs/units within their division/area and should reflect at the very least their Top+ 20 items. Data on which to base prioritization decisions shall be provided on the Outcomes, Data and Evidence Sheet. The program review requests for allocations in each category must be ranked in priority order, (e.g., from their top #1 need to their # 20). All other items that are not prioritized in the top 20 are to be listed as well but as "un-prioritized requests" in order to provide full transparency in prioritization.

After Snapshots are submitted by their respective deadlines, Program Review Division Chairs provide the IPROC Coordinator with Snapshots for their Division for posting on SharePoint. The Program Review Division Chairs also provide Level 1 Snapshots to the IPROC Coordinator, who then takes each Division Snapshot and separates out each request category (e.g., Technology, personnel, facility request, equipment, supplies/minor equipment, etc.) and requesting area (Division). A copy of each Division's ranked requests for each area is then provided to the SCC Standing Committee responsible for prioritizing those compiled lists. Once the SCC standing committees have completed their task, the Co-chairs provide the ranked Top

20+ list, or more if requested by the IPRC depending on finances, to the IPROC Coordinator by the prioritization deadline, which usually falls in the third week in March.

Note: Deans/Directors, Vice Presidents and the relevant SCC Standing Committee Co-Chairs are to serve as "gatekeepers" to ensure that requests in each category of the snapshot do not belong in another section. *Items that are incorrectly listed in a category that should clearly be included in the prioritization of a different category are to be removed and included in the correct category prior to being sent forward.*

Unranked Prioritization Lists
A copy of the Division Vice President's Top 20+ Lists, called the Unranked Prioritization Lists, is sent to the IPRC Coordinator. The IPROC Coordinator posts these lists on SharePoint for transparency purposes. Then, the IPROC Coordinator gathers all like requests (per category) from each Division, places these into an email and forwards these to the respective SCC committee Co-Chairs responsible for prioritization. These lists can be copied and placed into an Excel spreadsheet sortable by column for use by the Committee during prioritization discussions.

Top 20+ Lists
The determination as to how many items will be prioritized will be made by the IPRC Co-Chairs in consultation with the Budget Committee Co-Chairs and the SCC Co-Chairs, all of whom have a broader understanding of the financial outlook for the coming academic year. This determination will be made prior to the distribution of the Unranked Prioritization Lists so that the SCC Standing Committees can be notified as to how many items they are to prioritize.

When the SCC Standing Committee Co-Chairs receive their Unranked Prioritization Lists, they are notified as to how many items they are to prioritize. Usually, this number is around the top 20 ranked items they prioritize, but depending on financial constraints, the actual number may be lower or, in a particularly good fiscal year, the number of requests could even be higher. Thus, the name "The Top 20+ List" was created to identify the ranked prioritized lists.

SCC Prioritization:
Prioritization at the institutional level occurs at the SCC. As per the SCC Operating Principles, there are eight standing committees of the SCC, each of which 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 representatives from each of the College's constituencies 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

as well as on the SCC SharePoint site below:
https://portal.swccd.edu/Committees/SCC/SitePages/CommitteeHome.aspx

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	• Over-Arching Institutional Needs
IFC: Institutional Facilities Committee	• Facilities needs • Major Equipment (greater than $5,000)
ITC: Institutional Technology Committee*	• Technology needs**

*Please note: Academic Technology requests are prioritized by the Academic Technology Committee (ATC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, prior to the prioritization of all institutional Technology needs by the Institutional Technology Committee (ITC) in accordance with Policy and Procedures 2515. Non-Instructional Technology requests are prioritized by the ITC.

Program review requests for Personnel and Minor Equipment are compiled by each Division but are kept unranked. These lists are not forwarded on to prioritization by an SCC Standing Committee, but rather to the entity responsible for that budget development item or informational item request as outlined in the chart below:

Entity Responsible:	For Budget Development Purposes Only:
Division Vice President in consultation with Superintendent/President (Cabinet)	• New Classified Professionals Positions • New Confidentials Positions* • New Administrator Positions*
Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (FHP Committee)	• Faculty requests* (both replacement and new positions)
Division Vice President (should consult with School/Center/Area Dean/report back to the IPRC Coordinator)	• Minor Equipment requests
Institutional Technology Committee	• Replacement Technology Requests (for inclusion into the Technology Implementation Grid and software/hardware upgrade cycle)

*Note: All program review requests for new classified staff/administrators or faculty will be compiled and forwarded to the Human Resources Committee for their review and acceptance only in addition to the Division Vice President. This is done in order to maintain transparency and accountability in the prioritization process. The final decision shall be made by Cabinet and the FHP Committee respectively.

Preparation for SCC Prioritization:
Once all the Top 20+ Lists have been received by the IPRC Coordinator, they are then sent to the IT Department. With the assistance of the IT Department, the lists are input into an internal software program that has four different columns, one for each category.

At an SCC meeting prior to prioritization day, the SCC receives a report from the Student Outcomes and Assessment Review (SOAR) Committee, the SCC Standing Committee responsible for discussing and analyzing ISLO and other institutional Data. SOAR provides a place for institutional dialogue regarding these important data elements as well as makes recommendations and suggestions to the SCC regarding teaching and learning, which, in turn, provide a basis for the prioritization of resources based on our College Mission, our Strategic Priorities, Institution-Set Standards and other key institutional plans.

SCC Prioritization:

On SCC prioritization day, SCC core membership (4-4-4-4-1-1members) and the Standing Committee Representatives to the SCC meet at a designated classroom with computers so that each member can prioritize his/her list. Members are reminded of the recommendations from the SOAR Committee as well as the College Mission and Strategic Priorities. Once members have completed their prioritization, the final prioritization list is made available. Members select items from the prioritization software and rank them in the order they deem appropriate, all the while respecting the work of the Standing Committees by not selecting items out of their ranked order.

The Master List

The final prioritization list which includes the prioritization of all Top 20+ lists by every SCC member is called the "Master List." This list is shared with all SCC members and all IPRC members before the identification of funding sources by the Budget Committee. Once all funding has been identified, the list is posted on SharePoint and made available to all campus constituencies. The Master List retains all ranking until the next Master List is produced. Funding of items is updated as often as necessary and made available to all for transparency and campus communication. The finalization of the Master Lists marks the end of the prioritization cycle, which begins again with the next cycle of program review.

The Annual Snapshot

Description and Purpose:

The Snapshot is a concise grid-like document used to document and track program goals, SLOs, resource allocation needs and how these items support the College Mission, institutional plans, and Strategic Priorities. The Snapshot is used annually by every program, and every unit on campus. It is either submitted separately as a Snapshot or as part of the Comprehensive (the Snapshot is included as the last section of the Comprehensive).

Parts of the Snapshot:

The Snapshot begins with the identification of the program or unit, program review designator and program review level (eg, L4a, L4b L3, etc). It includes the name of the program review lead individual, date of the last comprehensive and the names of individuals in the program or unit who have provided input into the Snapshot.

The Snapshot is comprised of the following sections:
1. Program Goals
2. Outcomes, Data and Evidence (ODE) Sheet
3. Resource Allocation Categories

Directions for filling out a Snapshot: (also see Appendix **C**)

Identify program information & details: (page 1 at the top of the Snapshot)

Insert the complete program/unit name, indicate its official designator, and identify the site at which the program/unit is located.

Check off the box which identifies your program review level.
- Levels 4a (Academic Program/Non-Instructional Unit) and 4b (Supervisor/Unit Lead) Level L3 (Director) *Directors who report to a Vice President have until Dec.; other Directors must work out their program review due dates with their Deans.*
- Level 2 (School/Center Dean)
- Level L1 (Vice President & Superintendent/President)

Identify the name of the Program Review Lead
State the date your Snapshot was submitted
List the last year your program/unit prepared a comprehensive program review.
List the name(s) or participating discipline/unit members

Fill out Section I: Summary Report for the Academic Year: (page 1 of the Snapshot)

List of Program/Unit Goals**:** Please list your program goals from your last Snapshot as well as new goals for the current academic year.
- The first column is where you list the goal for your program/unit. Be sure to list your goals ranked in the order of their importance with number 1 as the most important.

- The second column identifies the Strategic Priority or Institutional goal and objective that your program goal relates to. A list of Strategic Goals and Objectives can be found at the end of the Snapshot.   For example, a goal regarding how well a unit works within the College District could be listed as Organizational Effectiveness B-1.

- The third column identifies the Outcome, Data and Evidence sheet item number. Simply insert your unit/discipline designator with the number of the SLO to which you are referring. For example ENGL (designator) S1 (SLO number) or rather ENGL-S1. Please refer to the ODE section below for more specific details on how to fill out the ODE section and how to identify ODE items.

- The fourth column identifies the resource allocation request that is tied to this goal, if there is one. Many program/unit goals do not require funding; those that do should be identified here.

  Each resource allocation category has been assigned a capital letter (e.g. Major Equipment is category "A") so as a request is made on a category, the letter and then the rank in that category is listed. You do not need to name the category; just list the letter and rank #. For example, if the goal is to improve a classroom by purchasing new computers to convert it to a lab, the request would fall under the Technology category, which is letter C. So if you had two New Technology requests, they would be indicated as C1 and C2 respectively.

- The fifth column identifies costs related to stated goals. Check the respective box to identify cost. If there is no cost to the College District, please check the box that says N/A. For one time cost or ongoing cost, please indicate a specific amount. There may a case in which a stated goal requires both initial start-up costs as well as an annual license renewal fee. In that case, please list both costs.

- The last column identifies the Status of the goal. Here, you would identify if it is a new goal or if it is past goal. If it's a past goal, please indicate if the goal has been accomplished and the date it was accomplished, in progress, and an estimated Date Of Completion (DOC), or if the goal is no longer part of your program/unit's plan.

Fill out Section II: SLOs, Data and Evidence (ODE) Sheet: (page 3 of the Snapshot) According to accreditation guidelines, colleges are required to design learning outcomes, implement SLOs, review SLO and other data, analyze all collected data, and provide evidence that SLO analysis and other data have been utilized in decision-making at all levels at the institution. The Outcomes, Data and Evidence (ODE) Sheet helps SWC accomplish this mandate by:
1. Listing what evidence was consulted and used in decision-making for the allocation of resources.
2. Serving as a detailed reference for the Rationale sections in the Snapshot.
3. Documenting evidence used in the Program Review and resource allocation processes.

There are two tables available for stating data and evidence–one for "SLO Evidence/Data" and one for "Additional Sources of Evidence/Data." This is to address a specific evidence requirement for accreditation– institutions **must use evidence and data** in decision-making, and some of the evidence and data utilized **must come from SLO assessment results.** Please remember that the term SLO covers all learning outcomes assessment (AUOs, SAOs, CSLOs, PSLOs, ISLOs).

The ODE Sheet can be thought of in terms of an annotated bibliography. In other words, the items on the ODE Sheet can be referred to without having to write it all down again so instead of writing lengthy explanations describing evidence in Rationale sections, you can simply write (annotate) direct statements and reference the evidence code (e.g., ADMIS-S1 or ENGL-S3) as evidence, or proof.

On the ODE Sheet, be sure to list and describe all the evidence used in the Rationale sections throughout the rest of the Snapshot. The first two boxes ("Your Designator" and "Your SLO") are used together to create a unique code which is utilized in the rationale section of your Summary Plans to link your goals to your SLOs.

SLO Evidence/Data Table:

This is the table on which you include SLO data. On this table, you will find six columns:

- The first column is where you identify your program designator: Please insert your program's/unit's official designator, e.g. World Language = **WL**; Cashiering =

CASH; SWC Police Dept = **SWCPD**. Please refer to the Designator List to locate your program's unique designator.

- The second column is where your item is numbered**:** Simply number each of your program/unit's SLOs in the order listed. For example, the first SLO is **S1**, the second SLO is **S2**, the third SLO is **S3**, and so on. These can be ranked by importance but don't have to be. Reminder: SLOs cover all learning outcomes.

  Please note: Include only those SLOs that support any resource requests; you do not have to include all your program/unit's SLOs. Some academic disciplines assess hundreds of SLOs per year. Please do not list them all; **list only those SLOs that provide support for requests** being made in the Snapshot.

- The third column is where the ISLO Number is identified**:** All 16 Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) are numbered and listed at the end of the Snapshot for your convenience. The number of each ISLO is to the left. For academic disciplines, SLOs are aligned with ISLOs in CurricUNET. Visit specific course and program SLOs in CurricUNET to view the ISLO to which each is aligned. Links to CurricUNET can be found on our SWC home page under Faculty/Staff and on the SLO website.

  Please note: Academic disciplines are required to match each of their course and program SLOs to a specific ISLO. However, this is not the case for non-instructional units. Non-instructional units do not necessarily need to follow this rule. Non-instructional units can align multiple ISLOs to their SLOs. In some cases, they may align to all.   In such cases, simply write the word "**All**" in the box provided.

- The fourth column is where you identify the actual SLO that was utilized. Simply type in the SLO that was assessed verbatim. Please only insert one SLO per line on this table. A sample is provided in the ODE table for your reference.

- The fifth column identifies the Source or Means of Measurement**:** Briefly state how the SLO data was collected. For instance, "*in-class measures developed by discipline faculty*" or "*Campus Climate Survey*" can be inserted here.

- The last column is where your indicate the results of your SLO assessment: Offer a brief description of data to be used as evidence for supporting a resource allocation request in your Snapshot. An example is provided for you on the ODE sheet.

Additional Sources of Evidence/Data Table:

This is the table on which you include other data or evidence you used to support any resource allocation requests. On this table, you will find four columns:

- The first column is where you again identify your program designator: Please insert your program's/unit's official designator, e.g. Accounting = **ACCT**; Disabled Student Services = **DSS**; Finance = **FIN**. Please refer to the Designator List to locate your program's unique designator.

- The second column is where the source of data is numbered: Simply number the source of evidence/data in the order as you list them. For example, the first piece of evidence/data is **1**, the second is **2**, the third is **3**, and so on. Notice that this column requires only a number (e.g. 2) **with no "S"** in front of it as in the second column under the SLO section (e.g. S2); this is to distinguish SLO data from all other data.

- The third column is where you cite the source of your data and the means of measurement: Briefly state where the data came from or how the data was provided. For instance, you can write "Institutional Self-Set Standard," "Student Satisfaction Survey" or "SWC External Scan."

- The last column is where you indicate the results: Offer a brief description of data to be used as evidence for supporting requests in Snapshot and how this supports your request.

<u>Using ODES codes when writing Rationales</u>

Use the ODES codes created (e.g. **ADMIS-S1**) to cite your evidence/data to support claims made in the Rationale section your resource allocation category in the Snapshot. Rather than writing out or cutting/pasting long statements explaining evidence/data used, simply make a brief and direct sentence citing a specific piece of evidence/data listed on the ODES. Look at the first example provided for your reference in the Snapshot. The evidence/data is described in the results section as follows:

"After a comprehensive student survey, it was found that a large number of students (68%) registering for courses for the first time could not do so without direct assistance. In order to assist many students at once, Registration workshops were made available to new incoming students from local high schools. It was found that all students who attended the workshop were able to register for courses successfully without one-on-one assistance. It is recommended that funding be provided 1) to make the workshops available to all students and 2) to create an online workshop, similar to the on-site workshop, to train online students in the process."

Rather than inserting the entire sample paragraph above into the Rationale section of the Snapshot during your argument for an allocation, offer a brief (one sentence) conclusion instead citing the longer explanation in the ODES in the following manner:

"Students who participate in Registration workshops were more successful in registering for courses than students who did not (ADMIS-S1)."

Fill out Section III: <u>Categories for Prioritization</u>: (pages 4–7 of the Snapshot)

Include your program/unit's needs in each category as needed. There are several categories of needs in the Snapshot:

       A) Major Equipment
       B) Facilities
       C) New Technology Requests
       D) Overarching Needs
       E) Human Resources–New Classified Professionals/Confidentials/Administrators
       F) Human Resources–Faculty Hiring Prioritization
       G) Minor Equipment
       H) Replacement Technology Requests

Please ensure that all requests are tied these to program goals and SLOs by including those references. Each section is designed to be self-explanatory.

Please note: Not adhering to the explanations/exclusion items on the Category section and including items in your Snapshot that are not allowed may affect your items' incorporation into the prioritization process.

As explained in the prioritization and funding section of this handbook, the first four categories listed below will be prioritized. However, only the Top 20+ items of the Major Equipment, Facilities and New Technology prioritization lists will be forwarded to the Shared Consultation Council (SCC) for prioritization. The prioritized Overarching Needs List will be sent to Cabinet for their review and action. Resource allocation requests that don't make it to the Top 20+ List will not be lost; these shall remain archived as part of the Deans/Directors and Division Requests on SharePoint for future reference, institutional memory and transparency.

Categories for Prioritization:

A. **Major Equipment:** This section is for requests for major equipment, excluding technology-related requests, which is defined as single items in excess of $5,000. Examples that fit this category would be an aerial lift for Theatre, a cardiac monitor for Paramedic Program, TV studio cameras for the Telemedia program, special ADA compliant doors, Boating equipment for Crown Cove safety, or an electric cart.

B. **Facilities:** This category is intended to provide for updating and remodeling of classrooms, offices or other structures which are not funded by Prop R, Perkins funding or other categorical funding, which includes funding that is reserved and cannot be used except for special projects and/or programs. Examples that fit this category include a designated space for a Veteran's Welcome Center, the addition of electrical outlets in a classroom, a remodel of a lab classroom to fit additional computers, the addition of privacy screens in financial aid for student consultations, or a dedicated space for test proctoring in DSS.

C. **New Technology:** The New Technology category is only for new technology requests in excess of $2,500. Examples that fit this category are special speech software for DSS student computers, new servers for network management, special software licenses, audio/visual equipment for classroom, a MAC computer for new graphics arts classroom, or custom database software for HR.

Please note: The Technology Resources category has an additional column not found in other categories, titled "Tech Plan Item," which replaces the Strategic Priority Column. As the Institutional Technology Plan incorporates Strategic Planning, both are not required here. The Tech Plan item column requests the number of the Institutional Technology Plan that best relates to that request. Please click on link provided on the Snapshot to see the Tech Plan and to see the example cited on the Snapshot.

Replacement Technology Needs are NOT to be included in section C; replacement technology requests are to be listed in category H below. Replacement items include replacement computers, monitors, or printers, etc. as well as software updates and

replacement of other technology items which are addressed in the SWC Technology Plan on a scheduled rotation basis. Please note: Including replacement items inappropriately in the New Technology category would skew the College's resource allocation process.

D. **Overarching Needs:** This category is only for items that do not fit neatly into any other category. Overarching Needs should not include requests for items that clearly belong in the other resource allocation categories, such as technology, facilities, personnel, or major equipment requests. Deans/Directors, Vice Presidents and the Educational Planning/Enrollment Management Committee Co-Chairs are to serve as "gatekeepers" to ensure that requests in each category of the snapshot do not belong in another section. Examples that fit this category are funds for specialized training of staff, registration fees for faculty/staff to attend conferences, marketing for academic programs or student services, tuition for health & safety courses required for accreditation, licensing or legal compliance, development of a College District-wide emergency disaster plan or ADA compliance items. *Items that are incorrectly listed in a category that should clearly be included in the prioritization of a different category are to be removed and included in the correct category prior to being sent forward.*

The last four categories deal with two Human Resources requests, requests for Minor Equipment and Replacement Technology. These following categories are included in the Snapshot for budget development purposes only:

E. **Human Resources: New Unfunded Classified Professionals, Confidentials or Administrators.** This category provides a place for new personnel requests. These include Classified Professionals, Confidentials and Administrators. These requests will be compiled and then acted by Cabinet. Please note: **Replacement positions** for positions in this category shall follow the SCC-approved **HR Memo for Personnel Requests Outside of Program Review**.

F. **Human Resources: New Faculty.** Requests for new faculty positions are determined and prioritized by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization (FHP) Committee, which uses set data and criteria as per the FHP agreement between the District and the Academic Senate. All faculty requests are ranked into the FHP Memo and are approved by Governing Board according to recommendation of the Superintendent/President and as per the financial resources of the District.

G. **Minor Equipment & Budget Requests:** These requests are for single items that cost $4,999 or less. These requests are limited to instructional supplies, office supplies, furniture, desks and other non-technology items. Each Division Vice President shall develop a list of compiled Minor Equipment and Budget Requests and then will develop the following year's budget after collaborating with Deans/Directors after review of minor equipment requests at Cabinet. Examples that fit this category are special equipment required for academic programs, student services or equipment for classrooms that is not accounted for in other institutional plans or the general fund.

H. **Replacement Technology Requests:** The Replacement Technology category is the category in which faculty and staff can ensure that their replacement technology needs are sent to the ITC for inclusion into the Technology Implementation Grid and Action Plan as well as the Tech Plan replacement cycle. Examples that fit this category would

be an upgrade to a special speech software for DSS student computers, a new server to replace an older one for network management, renewed software licenses, replacement equipment for a classrooms or a replacement computer or printer for an office.

Explanation of Prioritization Category Section Columns:

Rank #: List your ranked requests in each section with the most important item as number 1.

Instructional vs. Non-Instructional Need: In this column, indicate if the request that is being made is necessary for an Academic Program (or discipline) or a Non-Instructional (Operational Support Unit of the campus). **I** is for Instructional use and **NI** is for Non-Instructional use. This will assist the SCC Standing committees when they are prioritizing needs based on their rubrics.

Designator: In this column, please enter your program/unit's official designator as per the Designator List. (e.g. **EARTH** for Earth Sciences; **CEUD** for Community, Economic and Urban Development; or **HR** for Human Resources).

Short Title: This is a unique **five word** maximum title that you can give your request. An example might be something like *"Math Lab Replacement Computer"* or *"Reading Lab furniture upgrade.* This allows the Standing Committee to identify the exact request they may require more information on.

Description of Items Requested: The description of items requested should identify the specific item, model number, etc. being requested. For example, general requests for "Training Funds" or "Research Support" do not adequately explain the request. A specific request should identify what the request is intended for and should include a contact person's name should the Standing Committee require extra information. A few examples that fit this category would be *"New Faculty Member: BioTech Program," "new Full-Time Classified Professional for IP office," "office space for new FIN personnel," "Xerox WorkCentre 4260XF - multifunction printer (B/W); Mfg. Part: 4260/XFM|CDW Part: 2334577 UNSPSC: 4410150."* Designators are not required for this area but are helpful for abbreviating and identifying the request.

Rationale: In this column, provide **a concise two-four sentence rationale** for your program's request. An example of an appropriate rational that would fit is "*The current aerial lift is barely working and is used for instruction in TA 152, and TA 160-163. It is indispensable equipment because there is no other way to focus lighting equipment or hang scenery safely."* Please include source cites from the ODES where applicable.

One-Time Cost: Provide an estimate for a one-time cost item as accurately as possible. Do not include an amount that has not been researched or provided by the appropriate college office; no guessing! If there will be both a start-up cost and an ongoing cost for your request, such as an initial cost to purchase a license and an additional annual renewal fee (ongoing cost), please include both costs in the respective column. Having firm costs cited will assist the College in being able to have a clearer financial picture in order to provide as much as possible across the campus as well as to assist departments in having sufficient resources.

Ongoing Cost: Provide an ongoing cost estimate as accurately as possible. Do not include an amount that has not been researched; no guessing! If there is both a start-up cost and an

ongoing cost for your request, such as an initial cost to purchase a license and an additional ongoing cost to renew the license annually, include both costs in the respective column. Having firm costs cited will assist the College in being able to have a clearer financial picture in order to provide as much as possible across the campus as well as to assist departments in having sufficient resources.

Strategic Priority: In this column, identify and list the relevant strategic priority for your request as you did in Section one. For example, if yours is a request is for specialized software for an academic program, the applicable strategic priority might be Teaching & Learning A2 while if you work in Student Services and need an online program, you might use Student Success A3. Refer to section 1 for more details.

Tech Plan #: In this column, identify the area of the Institutional Technology Plan that best supports your technology requests. A link to the Tech Plan in provided in the Snapshot as well as an example.

Once all these sections are done, your Snapshot is complete and ready for submission. Submit your completed Snapshot electronically to your respective Dean/Director/Supervisor and to your Division Program Review Chair by the Program Review Deadline. Your snapshot will be integrated into the prioritization process.

Comprehensive Program Review: An Overview

Description and Purpose:
A Comprehensive Program Review is a much more detailed document, which includes a deeper, self-reflective narrative review of the program or unit, its curriculum and degrees/certificates or services (as these apply), and how these relate to data provided and the College Mission, Strategic Goals and Priorities, institutional plans, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

At SWC, there are two Comprehensive Program Review forms: the form used by Academic Program Review (APR), and an Administrative Program Review form, which is utilized by all other Divisions (AAPR, BFAHRSPPR and SAPR)

General Parts of a Comprehensive:
The general sections that comprise a Comprehensive program review include the following:

- Executive Summary which lists the names and signatures of all required personnel and highlights the major findings of the comprehensive program review. The Executive Summary will provide the basis for the IPRC's report to the Shared Consultation Council (SCC) and the Governing Board.

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

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

- Comprehensive program review of the program/unit which addresses its long-term goals, functions and services; an evaluation of the data and survey results; and its response to a number of specific narratives, questions or criteria*. The Comprehensive program review should also include recommendations for improvement as well as a work plan that outlines resources required for implementation.

- A review form, signed by the appropriate reporting entity, indicating that all criteria have been adequately completed and addressed.

- The Annual Snapshot, which includes the Outcomes, Data & Evidence (ODE) Sheet: The Snapshot portion of the Comprehensive is the same as the individual Snapshot. This includes summary goals, learning outcomes and analysis of SLOs and data. The Snapshot is included as a part of the Comprehensive in order to link program/unit needs with our Mission, Strategic Planning and other institutional goals, as well as institutional plans, SLOs and other statistical data. In addition, it provides a clear pathway for the funding of program needs, which are included in a transparent prioritization process for the allocation of institutional resources, such as financial, personnel, technology, and facilities resources. The Snapshot section provides evidence that our institutional program review process utilizes data and analysis to support necessary changes within programs/units which provide for sustained continuous improvement. Included in the Snapshot, the Outcomes, Data & Evidence (ODE) Sheet provides a summary of the most significant outcome, data and evidence used for program/unit changes and which supports the program/unit's resource allocation request(s).

Deans/Directors, Vice Presidents and the SCC Standing Committee Co-Chairs are to serve as "gatekeepers" to ensure that requests in each category of the snapshot do not belong in another section. Items that are incorrectly listed in a category that should clearly be included in the prioritization of a different category are to be removed and included in the correct category prior to being sent forward. *Items that are incorrectly listed in a category that should clearly be included in the prioritization of a different category are to be removed and included in the correct category prior to being sent forward.*

A Checklist is also provided for each Comprehensive for ease in drafting the Comprehensive and to ensure that all sections have been adequately completed and/or addressed by the appropriate personnel. Comprehensives must be signed by the program/unit Dean or Director and then submitted in a timely and transparent manner by the IPRC-approved program review deadline in order to be included into the annual prioritization process.

*Note: Please refer to the specific guidelines on each comprehensive Program Review for additional details regarding the specific components of each Division.

Directions for Administrative Comprehensive

The Administrative Comprehensive form is used for both Non-Supervisory and Supervisory program/units in all three administrative Divisions, AAPR, BFAHRSPPR and SAPR.

Sections of the Administrative Comprehensive for **Non-Supervisory Units** (Level 4b):
The nine (9) sections that comprise an administrative Comprehensive report include the same sections as outlined previously. The actual Administrative Comprehensive form can be found in Appendix **D** as well as on the IPRC website.

- Executive Summary
- <u>Criteria I</u>: Functions and goals/AUOs of the unit
- <u>Criteria II</u>: Quantitative description of the unit
- <u>Criteria III</u>: Internal variables affecting unit
- <u>Criteria IV</u>: External variables affecting unit
- <u>Criteria V</u>: Evidence of the unit's effectiveness
- <u>Criteria VI</u>: Student success
- <u>Criteria VII</u>: Other comments and concerns not previously addressed
- <u>Criteria XIII</u>: Administrative Unit's Recommendations
- <u>Criteria IX</u>: The Annual Snapshot, which includes the Outcomes, Data & Evidence (ODE) Sheet. Complete the Annual Program Review Snapshot for your unit. All recommendations must be substantiated either by responses to the criteria above or by additional information included in the Comprehensive program review.

<u>Sections of the Administrative Comprehensive for **Supervisory Units** (Levels 3, 2 and 1)</u>:
The fourteen (14) sections that comprise an administrative Comprehensive report include the same sections as outlined previously. The actual Administrative Comprehensive form can be found in Appendix **D** as well as on the IPRC website.

Organization of Administrative Comprehensive Program Review:
- Executive Summary
- <u>Criteria I</u>: Functions and goals/AUOs of the unit
- <u>Criteria II</u>: Quantitative description of the unit
- <u>Criteria III</u>: Internal variables affecting unit
- <u>Criteria IV</u>: External variables affecting unit
- <u>Criteria V</u>: Evidence of the unit's effectiveness
- <u>Criteria VI</u>: Student success
- <u>Criteria VII</u>: Other comments and concerns not previously addressed
- <u>4 Narrative Questions</u>:
  - ➢ <u>Criteria VIII</u>: To achieve student learning, how does your unit…?
  - ➢ <u>Criteria IX</u>: To support student learning, how does your unit provide an environment that….?
  - ➢ <u>Criteria X</u>: Define your unit's effective and efficient use of the following resources.
  - ➢ <u>Criteria XI</u>: How does your unit contribute to the continuous improvement of the institution?
- <u>Criteria XII</u>: Administrative Unit's Recommendations
- <u>Criteria XIII</u>: The Annual Snapshot, which includes the Outcomes, Data & Evidence (ODE) Sheet. Complete the Annual Program Review Snapshot for your unit. All recommendations must be substantiated either by responses to the criteria above or by additional information included in the Comprehensive program review.

  The Snapshot is the section of the Comprehensive that is forwarded to the SCC committees responsible for prioritization for inclusion into our annual prioritization process or for budget development purposes, respectively.

  This Snapshot section is identical to the individual Snapshot, which includes program short-term and long-term goals as well as requests for resource allocations in eight (8)

different categories. Please refer to the Snapshot section in this handbook for more detailed instructions on how to properly fill out the Snapshot.

Directions for Academic Program Review (APR) Comprehensives

For academic program review purposes, the definitions of discipline and program are defined as follows as per Ed Code and Title 5:

- A discipline is a group of courses that are related by some common characteristics or goals. The disciplines for each school are defined overseen by the School/Center Dean and the discipline faculty in order to most effectively review the entire curriculum. A discipline may consist of more than one program.

- A program is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree or certificate, and includes both career/technical and/or transfer objectives.

Sections of a Comprehensive APR:

The eight (8) sections that comprise a Comprehensive Academic Program Review (APR) report include sections outlined previously as well as discipline-specific questions required for thorough review of academic courses of study and programs.

Organization of Academic Program Review Comprehensive:
- Academic Program's Executive Summary
- Component I: Academic Program Course Review Form
- Component II: Program of Studies/Major Review Form
- Component III: Response to Previous Review
- Component IV: Review of SWC Statistical Data
- Component V: Criteria for Academic Program Review
- Component VI: Academic Program's Recommendations
- Component VII: The Annual Snapshot, which includes the Outcomes, Data & Evidence (ODE) Sheet This section of the APR Comprehensive is the section that in forwarded to prioritization committees for inclusion into the annual prioritization process or for budget development purposes respectively. This Snapshot section is just like the individual Snapshot and includes program short-term and long-term goals as well as requests for resource allocations in eight (8) different categories. To complete the Snapshot, please refer to the Snapshot section in this handbook for instructions.

The actual APR Comprehensive form can be found in Appendix **E** as well as on the IPRC website. For help with specific APR questions, please contact the current APR Chair.

Rubrics for Prioritization

In this section of the IPRC handbook, the rubrics for the four SCC Standing Committees responsible for prioritization can be found.

<u>IFC Prioritization Rubric</u>
Scoring Categories for Major Equipment and Facilities Prioritization

    A. Safety and Health (5)
    B. Academic Accreditation or Standard (4)
    C. Student, Program, or Department Achievement (3)
    D. Savings, Cost Avoidance, and/or Efficiency (2)
    E. Campus Environment, Community Aesthetics, and/or Legacy (1)

Budget Development Process
Scoring Multiplier Matrix and Relative Point Totals

Facilities Description:

_____

Category/Emphasis	Significantly Above (5)	Above (4)	Slightly Above (3)	Routine (2)
A. Safety and Health (5)	(A)5=25	(A)4=20	(A)3=15	(A)2=10
B. Academic Accreditation or Standard (4)	(B)5=20	(B)4=16	(B)3=12	(B)2=8
C. Student, Program, or Department Achievement (3)	(C)5=15	(C)4=12	(C)3=9	(C)2=6
D. Savings, Cost Avoidance, and/or Efficiency (2)	(D)5=10	(D)4=8	(D)3=6	(D)2=4
E. Campus Environment, Community Aesthetics, and/or Legacy (1)	(E)5=5	(E)4=4	(E)3=3	(E)2=2

Member's Score/Initial: _____   _____

_____   _____ = _____

To determine the relative scoring point total for consideration in the budgeting process:

Category will determine first multiplier value: (A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1)

Emphasis will determine second multiplier value:
Significantly Above Average=5; Above Average=4; Slightly Above Average =3; Average =2

Point total is determined by the formula: Category x Emphasis = Score
Some facilities/equipment may have Primary and Secondary points for two categories, the Primary and Secondary scores will be totaled to determine relative ranking.

Below is the rubric created and utilized by the **Institutional Technology Committee** (ITC) for prioritizing the ATC's Top 20+ list and the Non-Instructional Technology Tope 20+ List:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">Institutional Technology Program Review Rubric</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" align="center">Prioritization Criteria and Weights</td></tr>
<tr><td>*Number*</td><td>*Criteria*</td><td>*Weight*</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>**Urgency:** The extent to which current curriculum or services cannot be provided without the item in question, i.e., maintenance of current programs or compliance with laws, regulations, UDE/ADA, licensing or certification requirements.</td><td>50</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>**Collaboration:** Shared use of resources across campus or between programs or units; compatibility between labs, classrooms, offices and programs.</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>**Sustainability:** Continued use of requested technology items in terms of ongoing support requirements and replacement costs. Existing resources are available to sustain the request. The lower the need for additional resources to sustain the item, the higher the sustainability.</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>**Efficiency:** Make the most of available funds, e.g., taking relatively new computers that no longer work in one area due to high end user and moving to lower end user, implementing a less expensive solution to resolve the given need even if not specifically what was requested, allocating different powered hardware for different uses, using key servers where possible, etc.</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>**Growth:** Role of new technology in expanding or improving curriculum or college services.</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**Maximum Points**</td><td>100</td></tr>
</table>

Southwestern College

ACADEMIC SENATE

2013– 2014   Academic Technology Committee Prioritization Rubric

The ATC prioritizes academic technology needs based on the following definition of academic technology: Academic Technology is technology that is used to support student success in fulfilling course and program learning objectives.

Academic Senate Technology Committee (ATC) program review Rubric		
Prioritization Criteria and Weights		
Number	*Criteria*	*Weight*
1	**Urgency:** Current curriculum cannot be taught or students cannot be supported without the item in question, i.e., maintenance of current programs or compliance with transfer articulation agreements, laws, regulations, UDE/ADA, licensing or certification requirements.	40
2	**Industry Standard:** Technology changes have made current technology obsolete and updates must be acquired for students to attain job skills for entry level positions and can't be taught without it or students cannot be supported in their educational goals.	25
3	**Growth:** This criteria considers the role this new technology plays in expanding or improving curriculum, learning assistance services, and academic support services (i.e. library).	15
4	**Collaboration**: Multiple programs will benefit because multiple departments have requested this item and purchase will impact a large number of students.	10
5	**Total Cost of Ownership**: This criteria considers the initial and ongoing cost of obtaining, supporting, maintaining, and/or replacing the item, including institutional software licenses. A low cost of ownership is more desirable than a high cost.	10
	Maximum Points	100

ATC Approved: March 6, 2014

Educational Planning and Enrollment Management Committee
Rubric for Overarching Needs 2014

Category⬇ Emphasis➔	0 Not important	1 Important	2 Very important
Student Success/Persistence/Retention/Completion (5x)			
Program/Department Achievement (3x)			
Accreditation/Academic Standard (1x)			
TOTAL SCORE			

Directions:

A form created in Google Drive allowed committee members to show the value of each Overarching Needs request according to categories and levels of emphasis as determined by the committee.

A link to the form was emailed to each committee member. Members were required to sign in but could use an alias if they wished to remain anonymous. Committee members were asked to:

1. Read the request that appeared above the voting chart.
2. Determine the EMPHASIS (not important, important, or very important) of the request in terms Student Success/Persistence/Retention/Completion.   Click the radio button that represents the EMPHASIS of the request.
3. Determine the EMPHASIS (not important, important, or very important) of the request in terms Program/Department Achievement. Click the radio button that represents the EMPHASIS of the request.
4. Determine the EMPHASIS (not important, important, or very important) of the request in terms Accreditation/Academic Standard.   Click the radio button that represents the EMPHASIS of the request.

Once members expressed their values for each request, they sent their answers in. Google Drive tabulated the raw values for each request.

When all of the "votes" had been received, columns of scores were totaled. There were three columns per request: Student Success, Achievement, and Accreditation. The column totals were multiplied by the category multiplier; that is, the column total for Student Success was multiplied by 5, the column total for Achievement was multiplied by 3, the column total for Accreditation

was multiplied by 1. Then those three new subtotals were added together for a total value for the request.

The total value for each request was transferred to a table listing all of the requests. The request list was then sorted from highest value to lowest value per request. The requests were then numbered (1, 2, 3, etc.) according to their total values. The prioritized list was then sent for inclusion in SCC Prioritization.

SAMPLE
EP/EMC   Rubric for Prioritization 2014
Overarching Needs

Request: Increase security, safety and emergency preparedness of the HEC, NC to include: police/security personnel, surveillance cameras, alarms and panic buttons, as well as, training on managing emergencies. (HEC, NC AS)

	Not important (0)	Important (1)	Very important (2)
Student Success/ Persistence/ Retention/ Completion (5)	○	○	◉
Program/ Department Achievement (3)	○	◉	○
Accreditation/ Academic Standard (1)	◉	○	○

Program Review Timeline & Process (Table 1)

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 for the following academic year. • Units assemble a program review team, identifying a lead person and a committee. • The 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.) For programs with an approved outside accrediting agency, a copy of the outside agency's program review can replace the comprehensive program review. However, Snapshots are still 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; in addition, the SCC receives updated data including, but not limited to, Data Dashboard, results and analysis from the Campus climate Survey and the Student Satisfaction survey, etc.
November 1	• Discipline/Unit levels complete a Comprehensive or Snapshot as assigned, securing signatures of committee members before submitting a final report to their School Dean/Director for review, signature and incorporation into the Dean/Director program review report. School Dean/Director reviews the program review report for completion, makes any comments in the comments sections, and signs off on the report before submittal to the Program Review Division Chair. Division Chairs provide copies of the Snapshots to the IPRC Coordinator for posting on SharePoint.
December 1	• School Dean/Director reviews all program review reports from his/her area and includes ranked program review requests in his/her snapshot, which is then submitted to the respective Division Vice President.
December 15	• The Vice President reviews all program review reports in his/her Division for completion, accuracy, signatures, and then incorporates ranked program review requests into the Vice President (Division) snapshot.
January 31	• 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 1	• 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 charts on pages 10 of the IPRC Handbook.
March 1	• Standing Committees are sent their respective portions for prioritization. Prioritization is done by each standing committee as per the Program Review Handbook procedures and in accordance to their criteria and/or rubrics.
Late March	• Prioritized Top 20+ lists are submitted to the IPRC Co-Chairs, which are then work with IT staff to input these into the prioritization software used by SCC for final prioritization.
April	• SCC receives recommendations from the SOAR Committee stemming from institutional dialogue regarding analysis of SLO assessment and other institutional data to provide guidance and institutional dialogue prior to prioritization of needs stemming from program review. The SCC then ranks all Top 20+ prioritized program review lists.
May	• SCC prioritization results are finally compiled into a ranked Master Prioritization List, which is later separated into One-Time and Ongoing costs and submitted to Budget Committee for identification of funding source. Once identified by the Budget Committee, the Master List is then returned to the SCC for final approval and for dissemination to the campus community.