

| |
|-----------------------|
| |
| Program Review |
| |

| | |
|---|--|
| For Academic Year: 2018-2019 | |
| 1. File Rankings | File of Rankings of all requests sent to Becky Opsata, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation and Daniela Ballif, Financial Officer on April 22, 109. Columns with possible funding sources to be added and Budget Committee to review and provide recommendations. |
| 2. Permanent Staff | Requests for the same positions from various sources were grouped as much as possible if able to identify as such. Some areas supported a position but did not provide additional information for the request; no justification was included. Positions were ranked according to the amount of information provided and matched with the rubric. |
| 3. Faculty Hires | These were listed in alphabetical order for ease of reading but were not ranked. To be used by the FTFH (Box 2A) committee |
| 4. Faculty Needs | The major theme was reassigned time requested by faculty. These requests were not ranked because there was not enough information that would be able to use to justify the ranking for all requests and there were other considerations about reassigned time that the committee could not assess. Reassigned time was one of the requests that was much more present this year, more so than in the past, and thus separated for greater clarity. |
| 5. Facilities | There were some major and serious requests in facilities that seem best to classify as infrastructural maintenance across the campus. Perhaps the Program Review process is being used as a way to document such items, yet it seemed appropriate for the college to address separately and not through Program Review, such as the faulty HVAC systems in various areas, leaky roofs, requests for additional new classroom space, request for a STEM center, requests new labs classrooms. |
| 6. Classrooms and Teaching technology: | All classrooms are not at standards agreed upon. Faculty requesting basic equipment of current technology, such as podiums, computers and document cameras in classrooms. Classroom computers were repeatedly requested. There was much mention of antiquated equipment, that are no longer effective tools for instruction. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>7. Ongoing Budget:</p> | <p>Costs of recurring expenses continues to go up, yet the budgets continue to be rolled over and have not increased to meet the increased costs or any additional costs.</p> |
| <p>8. Tutoring:</p> | <p>Tutoring continues to be a request from all areas, as was the previous year. Those that have tutoring face increased costs due to minimum wage increasing.</p> |
| <p>9. Safety Issues:</p> | <p>While safety issues have for the most part not come up in Program Review as of late, some issues still seem to be raised. Falling screens cited and the need for AED devices as recommended from the Safety Committee.</p> |
| <p>10. Training for Program Review and information from Program review:</p> | <p>More emphasis needs to be on writing to the rubric, which reflects the college directions, instead of the mechanics of using the webs system. At the end of the cycle, departments need feedback as to why their request(s) do not get funded. As part of the training, writers need to be aware that non-experts are reading their reviews. Terms specific to disciplines need to be defined for further clarity and understanding, and justifications clearly presented.</p> |
| <p>Work on Process and Template of Program Review</p> | <p>The Program Review task force made several recommendations about the template for Counseling-SRC and various detailed recommendations to instructions and headings for further clarity. A recommendation was made to have a check-list as part of the final review and have signature sheets available for signatures on Validation Day. An update to the Handbook would include the current rubric as well as definitions used, as well as reorganized for further clarity. In terms of the process, early identification of writing and validations teams should be made and training provided for these together. Training should include writing and data analysis. Greater clarity of what the APR and IPRs should address is needed, and as well as better integration of the time lines for all programs reviews. A development of a replacement cycle for major ticket items such as furniture is needed, as was done with faculty computers. Further integration and alignment with funding sources and program review is needed.</p> |
| <p>Future recommendations from the Program Review Committee:</p> | <p>In review of the composition of the membership of the Committee, the PRC requests that College Council revisit the current structure. 1) The current membership includes representatives from Foundation for College Success, Matriculation Committee, and Workforce Development Committee which have now have been integrated into a different format. 2) The PRC has also memberships from the Information Technology Committee and Research and Planning Committee which have been vacant for the past three years and these may be served as consultants as needed instead of permanent membership.</p> |