

Program Review Committee

Annual Report 2019-20

For Academic Year 2019-2020	
Accomplishments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed a crosswalk of 2019-20 approved items and prior committee’s rankings. • Moved forward to approval a recommendation to remove the ranking of position requests from the Program Review Committee ranking process • Reviewed accreditation standards requiring PRC input and feedback • Provided training in the college’s resource allocation process, including how to read and rank program review requests, to returning and new members • Worked collaboratively with other committees involved in the resource allocation process to improve communication and workflow • Reviewed program review template and process and made recommendations for improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduced redundancies in the template ○ Incorporated recommendations from SES, Program Review Taskforce ○ Consolidated comprehensive program review into two sections ○ Removed requests for faculty, staff, or management positions from the critical needs ranking • Ranked program/department requests based on the established rubric • Read comprehensive and annual program reviews and identified common program review themes and request trends
Collegewide Themes and Request Trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple requests for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program marketing/advertising assistance and materials ○ Professional development ○ Creation of additional “sticky” spaces and tutoring spaces ○ Create annual refreshment cycle for items needing replacement on a regular basis (i.e., chairs, tables, etc.) ○ Technology: The need for more portable devices (tablets and laptops) to support innovation in instruction; desire for desktop computers in classrooms
Additional Ranking Subgroup Observations – Areas for Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items not directly student-focused did not score as well using current rubric but are essential for program/college functioning • Program review writers did not often fully address the rubric in their justification resulting in lower rankings • Budget figures were often missing or included a range rather than a single figure

<p>Next Year's Tentative Goals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review timeline of ranking process • Continue collaborations with other resource allocation bodies (i.e., Budget, Workforce Development, SES, etc.) • Incorporate ranking subgroups' observations in template and process improvement recommendations • Discuss the continued inclusion of professional development requests in the program review resource allocation process and future collaboration with professional development committee • Review ongoing budget augmentation process • Review rubric to be more inclusive of requests not as directly related to student success but integral to improvement of college/program functions • Improve upon the training opportunities for program review writers • Reorganize Program Review Committee Sharepoint to make it more user-friendly to the committee members • Read 2020-21 program reviews for collegewide themes • Rank 2020-21 program review requests
------------------------------------	--