



**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
Executive Summary (Adopted April 30, 2010)**

**Mission Statement** The College of the Redwoods’ Program Review Committee leads and facilitates authentic assessment as it relates to student success and planning at the institution for all subject and service areas. The committee reviews Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews that provide the strong foundation upon which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, states and documents quality improvement plans and goals including providing the direction of prioritization of funding, and support needs as organized under the strategic planning objectives. **(Mission Statement Adopted November 6, 2009)**

**Objective:** To provide an Executive Summary of all the Program Reviews submitted for the academic year of 2010-2011. The summary includes common themes found in Trends, Assessment, and Budget.

<b>Trends: Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding accuracy of data tables was noted.</li> <li>• Success rates for on-line courses (for every discipline) are clearly lower than for face-to-face courses. This is an institution-wide issue that needs careful analysis and remedy as we move forward with expanding our on-line offerings.</li> <li>• A more comprehensive and formalized process to collect degree and certificate completion rates, transfer rates, and a follow-up system for our graduates, including graduate and employer survey data, needs to be implemented for all programs district-wide. <i>(This was noted in the 2010 Master Executive Summary.)</i> Some programs are starting to collect this data, but a standardized system that features the coordinated efforts of both individual programs and the Institutional Research Department needs to be designed. Additional staffing in the IR department will likely be needed to accomplish this.</li> <li>• More quantitative data and data analysis is needed for the Student Services and Administrative Services Program Review reports. Longitudinal data such as “numbers of students (or other constituents) served” should be included alongside the narrative analysis in these reports. More consistency of format between the Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services Program Review templates is needed for more thorough analysis of available data. Tracking and analysis of this type of data has started in some Student Services and Administrative Services departments, but more needs to be done.</li> <li>• The Trends analyses that are currently being generated by the PRC need to move through established Integrated Planning channels so they can inform other committee work on campus, and inform district-wide institutional planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New IR Director will be directly involved in identifying and correcting problematic data.</li> <li>• What do we do with inconsistent data or variations in data when the population is too small [how do we make meaningful comparisons when only a few courses are pre-populated or when courses are only offered every few years, etc.] <i>(Note: this was also identified in last year’s executive summary).</i></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mechanism for responding to (and following up on) PRC Trends analyses and recommendations needs to be implemented for individual Programs and Program Review authors. We know that Programs have access to the PRC Trends analysis, but how do we know whether (and in what ways) Programs are responding to these analyses and recommendations? An added follow up section within the annual template along the lines of “How have you responded to last year’s PRC recommendations?” might help to capture this information. A written follow-up response addressing the recommendations (and how they might be implemented) could be another remedy for this issue.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs have been “flagged” by the PRC using very specific rubrics: 1) enrollment, 2) need, 3) fulltime faculty support, 4) cost/FTES ratio, 5) ability to maintain appropriate equipment and/or facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRC would like direction where/to whom these concerns should be directed. The PRC recognizes its roll in assessment evaluation, but is not a recommending body.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some programs provided only limited information from Centers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Del Norte and Mendocino need to be more involved in the process of program review. One example in the case of program assessment for bookstore operations there was no information from either site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many programs reviews included the need for professional development training (especially in the area of technology services).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was clear improvement in the use of labor market data, however there are still deficiencies and improvement on data interpretation should be encouraged.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally the CR’s data shows fairly high retention for classes. However, success rates vary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention and success data may not be accurately representing student trends. Students that stop attending classes (following census) are counted in retention, but obviously fail the class, therefore negatively affecting student success. Recommendation is for more specific data that will identify students with “last attended dates” other than the final meeting. This should more accurately assess student “success,” and more accurately represent “true” retention.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs have expressed concern regarding dwindling student support services (DSPS, Crisis Counselor, Academic Counseling, Matriculation officer).</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs would benefit from improved articulation with other schools.</li> </ul>

<b>Budget: Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over long term obligations of grant-funded positions; as well as programs that are primarily supported by grant funds. This is a concern for the committee due to district sustainability. No district funds have been identified through the program review process to replace the monies generated by various grants to sustain programs and/or personnel once outside funding has ended. In the past, this procedure has been done outside of the planning process.</li> <li>• Furthermore, additional concerns regarding the sustainability of facilities and equipment purchased by DIEM and Measure Q funds. This too has been done outside the planning process in previous years and needs to become part of the current planning process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of a review of long term financial obligations of grant funded programs prior to program approval. Secure funding of long term programs should be part of the planning process, especially programs that require specialized equipment and maintenance that are not supported by the grant.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many (most) programs are short staff and/or faculty. With the loss of positions that are not replaced, the workload issues are directly impacting productivity and morale.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget issues are an obvious concern, but if personnel cannot be replaced, serious consideration of workload obligations must be addressed. Goals addressed in the program reviews may not all be accomplished.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs identified equipment and facilities concerns that could be safety issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities and Budget Planning committees will receive program review summaries for consideration in the prioritization process.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs identified concerns regarding equipment replacement and/or maintenance costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider cost of insurance for expensive, program dependent equipment.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funds are inadequate for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new technology and routine updates district-wide.</li> <li>• maintaining facilities and equipment repairs district-wide.</li> <li>• equipment replacement and updates district-wide.</li> <li>• departmental expendable items (printing, light-bulbs, paper)</li> <li>• departmental nonexpendable items (i.e. library resources).</li> <li>• faculty and staff development district wide.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Currently, funding requests for non-expendable and capital items requested in the Program Review documents are not linked to the assessment and quality improvement plans identified by the program.</li> <li>• Many departments and programs share discretionary budgets, district wide. This has made it difficult for authors to determine if their programs' actual budget is adequate. The recommendation is for the district to resolve this convoluted process for clarity purposes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* It was noted that many of the findings were also identified in the 2009/2010 academic year as well.</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment: Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for a college-wide process to gather and assess information from students directly, both those who graduate and those who leave for other reasons, or from transfer institutions and employers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Surveys – Why are students not returning? What are students doing years later? (Alumni tracking)</li> <li>• Career placement and Employee satisfaction surveys.</li> <li>• Student satisfaction surveys.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Programs are making great strides in the development and assessment of Program Level Outcomes. Most have submitted a 5 year plan</li> <li>• Some programs are still having difficulty with assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment Coordinator will continue to work with faculty to develop 5 year assessment planning. By the end of 2011 all programs will have a plan submitted and included in their program review.</li> <li>• For programs that were identified as having less active or complete assessment, arrange specific and specialized training activities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve process for Liberal Arts and General Education comprehensive program reviews. The process is unnecessarily burdensome. A more streamlined document needs to be developed, and final decision as to what defines a Program and courses that would be included in PLO assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with Assessment Coordinator to facilitate this process.</li> <li>• Recommend more consistency in how programs address basic skills students in their program review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An addition to PR templates: 1) Assessment planning documents. 2) Faculty/Staff request forms, for prioritization 3) Inclusion of assessment results plans from the previous year.</li> </ul>	