

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2020-2021 Executive Summary**

**Committee Co-Chairs**

George Potamianos

Stephanie Burres

**Committee Members**

Anibal Florez  
Mike Peterson  
Cindy Hooper  
Katherine Schoenfield  
Philip Mancus

Anthony Luehrs  
Ashley Knowlton  
Heidi Bareilles  
Tami Engman  
Diqui LaPenta

## Executive Summary

The work of the Program Review Committee (PRC) is essential to building the foundation upon which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, and documents quality improvement plans districtwide and makes budgetary decisions through a transparent and consistently applied process. The committee reviews Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews in order to prioritize funding and support needs as organized under the strategic planning model. This report summarizes the committee's findings and highlights themes and areas for improvement.

Program review reports have continued to improve in quality this year; however, areas for additional improvement still exist. The committee would like to commend program review authors for their hard work and to recommend that professional development opportunities continue to be made available to personnel in all program and service areas on how to use data to inform strategic planning. Program reviews as a whole will benefit from more consistent data-driven planning and decision-making as well as follow-up assessment to determine the effectiveness of planning actions.

Over the past year, the PRC continued to perform its core responsibilities including, but not limited to, the following:

- Ensuring that each of the college's programs clearly identifies itself and its role in the context of the overall college mission
- Evaluating and analyzing data provided as part of comprehensive program reviews
- Monitoring programmatic compliance with the college's established assessment and curricular review cycles
- Establishing that program personnel have adequately reflected upon and documented the impact of the previous year's plans
- Determining that proposed program plans are informed by assessment and, if applicable, other factors like safety, compliance with outside agency requirements, etc.
- Reviewing and recommending programs for submission to the Program Viability Committee for further careful review, analysis, and recommendations

During the 2020-2021 academic year, the committee refined its new responsibilities related to the district's budget and planning processes. In addition to reviewing program submissions, the committee evaluated and ranked all program plans, not only the ones that contained resource requests. In order to do so, the committee used the existing rubric for evaluating non-personnel resource requests (the prioritization and ranking of staff and faculty requests is conducted by separate processes outlined in the college's policies and procedures). The PRC ranked the submitted plans in accordance with an established rubric and forwarded its rankings to the Dean's Council for those members to determine what plans could be funded through

discretionary and categorical budgets controlled by the Deans and Directors. After that process, the plans and resources that remained unfunded were routed to Expanded Cabinet for further funding review, informed by the PRC's plan ranking. After review by the Expanded Cabinet, the PRC rankings and funding sources were organized in a database and shared with all contact persons requesting resources through Program Review. The searchable database is available districtwide.<sup>1</sup>

The PRC believes that this is a clear, collegial, objective, and collaborative manner through which to support the college's efforts to allocate resources fairly and transparently. Because this was the second iteration of this process, committee members reviewed and revised the plan ranking rubric to eliminate ambiguity and redundancy. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) continues to use the Program Review Committee Executive Summaries to inform their decision-making and analytical processes. The PRC's plan rankings also inform the creation of the district's annual plan.

In an effort to engage in continuous quality improvement itself, this year the Program Review Committee engaged in thoughtful evaluation and revision of the way it handles a number of issues this year. Specifically, the committee has.

1. Made a number of changes to the Student Services and Administrative Areas report templates to better allow for assessment, planning, and improvement measurement to take place in those areas. In Instruction, this cycle typically occurs within either the assessment "Legacy System" or eLumen. For the Student Services and Administrative areas, the program review reporting template itself captured this improvement cycle information, because these areas do not report assessment through the eLumen and "Legacy" interfaces. These changes were done as per the recommendations of the Assessment Committee.
2. Responded to a curriculum committee request to put a "reminder" in the Instructional reporting templates for faculty to check AA-T degrees for currency with respect to the C-ID Transfer Model Curricula (TMC). The TMCs in all disciplines are reviewed by C-ID at the state level every five years, and we need to do that locally as well.
3. Re-examined its use of all of the rubrics and has changed them based on committee member and college constituent input (Appendix C).
4. Added a "Program Highlights" field to the Student and Administrative Services templates, to give program personnel in those areas the ability to promote their accomplishments during the previous year. This field has been a part of the Instructional templates for some time.
5. Evaluated all plans, not only the ones with resource requests associated with them. This

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://webapps.redwoods.edu/ProgramReview/RequestRankings.aspx>

was done this year to coordinate the program review process with the creation of the district's annual plan. Because the committee evaluated all plans submitted by the various programs, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee was able to gain a sense of what to prioritize in the annual planning document. The plans that contained resource requests went through the same process as it did last year to determine funding sources, and the results appear here in an effort to create transparency in the budget process:

<https://webapps.redwoods.edu/ProgramReview/RequestRankings.aspx>

Lastly, PRC members realize the crucial role they play in monitoring and encouraging the district's efforts to support the cycle of assessment, continuous quality improvement, and re-assessment, and is helping to develop a district-wide system for all programmatic areas of the college to link planning, assessment, and budgeting, and make this process transparent and readily accessible to entities both within and outside the district. The partnership between the Program Review Committee and the Assessment Committee this past year has been extremely valuable to this effort that will continue into the next academic year.

## **I. Introduction**

The College of the Redwoods' Program Review Committee (PRC) reviews and evaluates annual and comprehensive<sup>2</sup> program review submissions from all subject and service areas. The PRC leads and facilitates authentic assessment of college programs to improve student success and coordinate integrated planning. The work of the PRC is essential to building the foundation on which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, and documents quality improvement plans and goals. The process also informs the provision of District funds in order to implement identified plans related to larger district planning goals.

This report documents the important work of the PRC during the 2020-2021 Academic Year, including detailed analyses of submissions and Committee recommendations for future program review submissions.

## **II. Overview and Assessment of Program Review Submissions**

Instructional programs submitted 19 annual and 5 comprehensive reviews.<sup>3</sup> Student Service areas submitted 15 reviews and Administrative areas submitted 11 reviews.

The PRC used specialized rubrics to evaluate each program review submission (Appendix A). Each criterion in the rubric aligns with a section of the program review template. Sections are reviewed and assigned a rating of Exemplary (E), Satisfactory (S) or Developing (D) and, in some cases, combinations thereof (i.e. Satisfactory/Developing). Additionally, the PRC also utilized a Plan Ranking Rubric that evaluated Programs' plans for consideration in the College's Annual Plan and funding decisions for non-personnel resource requests. Below are descriptive statistics, general observations, and overarching themes derived from this year's Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative program reviews.

## **III. Instructional Program Reviews**

Highlights from the Instructional program reviews this year include:

- The Shively Farm developed a 60-member Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program, delivering once a week boxes of produce to shareholders. The farm also hosted a u-pick day with approximately 500 attendees and earnings over \$6000.
- Instructional areas successfully transitioned spring 2020 courses to new distance education (DE) and hybrid modalities in emergency response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Areas also submitted curriculum DE (and in some cases Correspondence (CE) addenda) so that courses can be offered online and in the prisons.
- The Pelican Bay Scholar's Program has developed two Biology courses and the first student club, the Pelican Bay Garden Club.
- Construction Technology, in partnership with Welding Technology and Art faculty,

---

<sup>2</sup> Comprehensive Reviews are completed on a 4-year rotating cycle.

<sup>3</sup> Comprehensive Reviews included analyzing data trends such as, enrollments, equity, and completions.

completed the construction of a "Tiny House." The Tiny House Project, which spanned three consecutive semesters, was designed to provide a cross-disciplinary, project-based learning experience for students who are interested in sustainable design and construction.

- Physical and Health Education developed a Personal Trainer Certificate of Recognition that will be offered in 2020-2021 academic year.
- Nursing students enrolled in NURS 4 were able to work with the Public Health Department engaging in contact tracing to help reduce COVID 19 infection in our community.

Instructional areas described in detail how their individual programs support the mission of the College. Instructional program reporting of assessment activities and evaluation of previous plans was consistent with last year's reviews.<sup>4</sup>

The consistent quality of Comprehensive Instructional reviews from last year to this year was noteworthy, because they remain overwhelmingly in the Exemplary/Satisfactory range. Nevertheless, because the sample includes entirely different programs each year, it is hard to draw a conclusion when comparing samples from year-to-year. All programs completing a comprehensive review should be commended for the high quality of submitted work.

**Table 1: Instructional Program Reviews (Annual)**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	89.5%	N/A	47.4%	52.6%
<b>S</b>	10.5%	N/A	47.4%	36.8%
<b>D</b>	0.0%	N/A	5.3%	10.5%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>				n = 19

**Table 2: Instructional Program Reviews (Comprehensive)**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
<b>S</b>	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	60.0%	40.0%
<b>D</b>	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix B for a detailed comparison of 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 data.

The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their programs. The PRC would also like to highlight the following programs for exceptional submissions, and recommend that authors for all programs review them as a benchmark for program analysis and improvement:

### ***Math***

- The program highlights and accomplishments sections show numerous important items indicating strong engagement and active, ongoing program improvement. There are plenty of accomplishments, including important outreach efforts.
- Program data are explained clearly with thoughtful narrative. Program authors provide interesting analysis and plans moving forward in the equity section particularly. This section is a model for future Program Review authors.
- The review offers a number of specific planning actions, including one that could remedy equity gaps in this program.

### ***Humanities***

- The program highlights and accomplishments sections show numerous important items indicating strong engagement and active, ongoing program improvement.
- The responses to the prompts were thoughtful and data were carefully analyzed and used to inform the program changes. Data are complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes; Factors impacting student achievement and learning are described in detail; Student equity data are thoroughly discussed.

## **IV. Student Services Program Reviews**

Highlights from the Student Services Program Reviews this year include:

- The Child Development Center received high marks on their accreditation site visit in March 2020 and received reaccreditation certification for another 5 years.
- DSPS completed intensive outreach to students during the COVID 19 pandemic including Zoom, face-to-face meetings, phone calls, and email in order to establish necessary services and accommodations.
- Financial Aid implemented electronic forms for students, improving the financial aid process for DE students, students who have difficulties making it to campus and those without access to printers.
- TRIO DN facilitated 748 meetings with counselors and advisors over the course of the

year and had a total of 735 attendees to workshops on tutoring, peer mentoring, orientation and academics.

**Table 3: Student Services Program Reviews**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Equity Data</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	80.0%	66.7%	33.3%	20.0%	53.3%	80.0%
<b>S</b>	20.0%	26.7%	40.0%	73.3%	40.0%	20.0%
<b>D</b>	0.0%	6.7%	26.7%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>						n = 15

This year’s student services program reviews were consistent with those from the previous year, with many areas receiving high marks. The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their service areas and would like to highlight the following exceptional programs, and recommend that program review authors consult them as a guide for overall program improvement:

***DSPS***

- Program review authors clearly demonstrated how the DSPS mission aligns with the mission of the college.
- Authors provided detailed and relevant assessment data in line with the College’s established assessment cycle. The program’s assessment findings were detailed and clearly informed planning actions and program changes.
- Evaluation of previous plans was detailed, and planning impacts were clearly described with relevant data.
- Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are clearly based on assessment findings.

***Library***

- Program review authors clearly demonstrate, with clear examples, how the library mission aligns with the mission of the college.
- The data section is complete and shows good analysis and reflection. Student achievement and learning factors are described well. This program works to enhance student equity and it is commendable that this program was crucial in providing services for students affected by the pandemic.
- All assessment is up to date and discussion of changes made based on assessment



findings demonstrate that the program is continuously working to improve student access to library resources.

- Program plans are directly linked to institutional planning goals and are also supported by assessment findings.

## V. Administrative Services Program Reviews

Highlights from the Administrative Service Program Reviews include:

- Marketing and Communications expertly orchestrated all outreach to students and the community in relation to the ever-changing circumstances on campus due to PGE Planned Outages and the COVID 19 pandemic.
- Dining services has implemented online ordering, allowing patrons to pre-order food and select what time they want their food ready for pickup.
- IT configured over 100 laptops and VPN connections to assist employees working from home during COVID and over 450 Chromebooks and 100 Windows laptops for loan to students in Eureka, Del Norte, and KT during COVID.
- IT provided remote desktop support for Nursing, Art, Networking, Forestry Management, and CADD to allow students to connect to computers on campus and have access to advanced software to advance their learning outcomes during COVID.
- The Office of Instruction secured \$200,000 from the Professional Resource Team to help build community, by funding fund the work of the Keep Teaching and the DE Coordinator.

Administrative reviews showed steady progress in the areas of planning and assessment, which indicates that programs are integrating last year’s recommendations. Scoring in the “Evaluation of Previous Plans” and “Program Information” sections decreased slightly overall.

**Table 4: Administrative Services Program Review**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	90.9%	45.5%	45.5%	18.2%
<b>S</b>	9.1%	36.4%	36.4%	72.7%
<b>D</b>	0.0%	18.2%	18.2%	9.1%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>				n = 11

Although gains were made, the PRC recognizes there is still difficulty for areas not directly involved in student learning to develop outcomes that relate meaningfully to student success. The PRC recommends that administrative services areas go through a similar process as student services areas to develop appropriate and measurable service-learning outcomes and work closely with the

Assessment Coordinator to accomplish this goal.

The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their service areas and would like to commend IT/TSS, which showed significant growth from last year in the area of assessment; the PRC recommends that program authors review IT/TSS's submission as a guide to overall improvement in writing program reviews.

### ***IT/TSS***

- Program review authors clearly demonstrate how the IT/TSS mission aligns with the mission of the college with clear examples.
- Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes, and the assessment explanations are detailed. Relevant data are provided to back up statements. Even with changes in workload, goals were still met.
- All assessment is up to date and the discussion of changes made based on assessment findings demonstrates continuous improvement efforts.

### ***Workforce and Community Education***

- The program's primary function is described in detail.
- Assessment analysis is detailed and thorough and activity has taken place on the college's established cycle. Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes.
- Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described. If a planning action was not carried out, an explanation was provided.

## **VI. Overarching Themes in Program Review**

*Improvements in Assessment and Data-Driven Planning:* PRC members noted, especially with Student Services areas, the increased use of quantitative data within assessment to inform planning actions. PRC members commend program personnel for moving toward more data-conscious assessment and directly using that to inform programmatic plans. To further strengthen the connections between program review and assessment the PRC co-chair will regularly attend Assessment Committee meetings.

*Program Indicators for Administrative Areas:* Committee members believe that the types of "program indicators," that are used in the Student Services reviews, might also be used in the Administrative areas, instead of the current use of "area outcomes."

*Distance Education:* Distance Education is no longer a separate program at the college; however, with increasing numbers of DE modalities being used across campus a discussion of DE activities may need to be included in instructional reviews moving forward.

## **VII. Committee Recommendations and Process Revisions**

The Program Review Committee continually focuses on improving the quality and efficiency of

the program review process. Consistent with this, the committee is considering the development of concise and detailed instructions, as well as targeted assistance for authors who seek to improve their submissions.

In accordance with continuous quality improvement, PRC members have reviewed all of the program review process “author feedback” from the last three years to determine areas of improvement to the PRC’s own process.

Committee members will also continue to improve the program plan ranking process, especially because it is directly tied to the district’s resource allocation.

Committee members realize that the biggest need moving into the next couple of years will be to work with the Assessment Committee and Assessment Coordinator to develop clear and systematic ways to document the process of outcome assessment, planning, plan implementation, and re-assessment in a way that is understood by the entire college community. The PRC recognizes that this work is occurring in all areas of the college—Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Areas—but the documentation of the process outlined above remains inconsistent and is not necessarily easy to locate. The PRC is optimistic that the widespread use of the eLumen system for outcomes assessment and dialog capture will integrate better with the program review process so that the process outlined above can be more consistently documented across program areas. The PRC will work with the Assessment Committee and other, relevant, entities over the next year to advance with this work.



**Appendix A: 2020-2021 Program Review Rubrics**

**College of the Redwoods PRC Administrative Services Evaluation Rubric**

(Revised 4/2018)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function identifies the program’s impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program but not the greater purpose;</p> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p>
<b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college’s established cycle which includes program learning outcomes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment, in general, is not being done within the college’s established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>
<b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p>	<p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to</p>	<p>Current action status is unclear;</p> <p>The impact of the action were not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in</p>

	An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or area.	why the action was not completed.	the future; Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.
<b>Program Planning</b>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests</p> <p>Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Actions clearly show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests;</p> <p>The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured</p>



## College of the Redwoods PRC Student Services Evaluation Rubric

(Revised 4/2018)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function identifies the program's impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Mission and function are clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Mission and function are clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program but not the greater purpose;</p> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p>
<b>Data Analysis/Program Indicators</b>	<p>Data are complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program changes;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were described in detail;</p> <p>Student equity outcomes or initiatives were thoroughly addressed.</p>	<p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program changes were present;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were clearly stated;</p> <p>Student equity was discussed.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or is unclear;</p> <p>Comparative analysis was absent or sparse regarding data program changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning;</p> <p>Student equity was not discussed or was unclear.</p>
<b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle which includes student and program learning outcomes;</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity was completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not</p>

	<p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment, in general, is not being done within the college's established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>
<b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b>	<p>Past planning actions were carried out, evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p> <p>A planning action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program.</p>	<p>Impact of planning actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>A planning action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current planning action(s) status is unclear;</p> <p>The impact of the planning actions were not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future;</p> <p>Status of Incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>
<b>Program and Discipline Planning</b>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests</p> <p>Planning actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Planning actions clearly show the expected impact on the program/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most planning actions show the expected impact on the program/student learning and can be measured.</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests;</p> <p>The impact of planning actions on program/student learning is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>



**College of the Redwoods PRC Instruction Evaluation Rubric**

(Revised 4/2018)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Mission of program or discipline clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Function identifies the program and discipline’s impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Mission of program or discipline aligns with the mission of the college; Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program or discipline mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program or discipline but not the greater purpose;</p> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p>
<b>Data Analysis- General/Program Indicators</b>	<p>Data are complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are described in detail; Student equity data are thoroughly discussed.</p>	<p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program or discipline changes are present;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are clearly stated; student equity data are discussed briefly.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or are unclear;</p> <p>Comparative analysis is absent or sparse regarding program or discipline changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning; student equity data are not discussed or is unclear.</p>
<b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college’s established cycle which includes student and program learning outcomes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are linked to program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity was completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment, in general, is not being done within the college’s established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>



	thorough and detailed.		
<b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or discipline.</p>	<p>Current status of actions taken is clear;</p> <p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>The impact of the action was not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future;</p> <p>Status of Incomplete plans are not explained sufficiently.</p>
<b>Program and Discipline Planning</b>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests</p> <p>Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Planning actions clearly show the expected impact on the Program and discipline/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most planning actions show the expected impact on the program or discipline/student learning and can be measured;</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program or discipline planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests;</p> <p>The impact of actions on program or discipline/student learning is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>

**Program Review Committee  
Plan Ranking Rubric  
(August 2019)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>Medium (2)</b>	<b>High (3)</b>
<b>Necessary to achieve an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective</b>	Has no alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has minimal alignment with Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has moderate alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has strong alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective
<b>Ranking by Program Review authors</b>	Low ranking	Low to mid ranking	Mid to High Ranking	High Ranking
<b>Identified as a need based on assessment. <i>For Instructional Program this would be SLOs.</i></b>	Has no link to assessment.	Has minor link to assessment	Has moderate link to assessment	Has strong link to assessment.
<b>Number of students affected</b>	No student affected.	Impacts smaller focused group of students	Impacts many students in multiple areas	Impacts students district wide
<b>Improves institutional efficiency</b>	Has no cost/benefit value	Has low cost/benefit value	Has moderate cost/benefit value	Has high cost/benefit value
<b>Meets a safety or legislated mandate</b>	Has no link to safety or mandate	Has low or indirect link to safety or mandate	Has moderate link to safety or mandate	Has strong link to safety or mandate
<b>Criticality of the request</b>	If unfunded there will be no disruption or service	If unfunded will have minor impact on service	If unfunded will have moderate impact on service	If unfunded will have major impact on service

**Appendix B: Year-to-Year Comparison of Program Review Submission**

2019-2020					
Instruction	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
<i>Annual Reviews</i>					
Exemplary	15	N/A	9	8	9
Satisfactory	1	N/A	7	7	7
Developing	0	N/A	0	1	0
% E	94.0%	N/A	56.0%	50.0%	56.0%
%S	6.0%	N/A	44.0%	44.0%	44.0%
%D	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%

n=16

<i>Comprehensive</i>					
Exemplary	7	5	2	4	3
Satisfactory	2	4	7	4	5
Developing	0	0	0	1	1
% E	78.0%	56.0%	22.0%	44.0%	33.3%
%S	22.0%	44.0%	78.0%	44.0%	56.0%
%D	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	11.0%

n=9

2020-2021					
Instruction	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
<i>Annual Reviews</i>					
Exemplary	17	N/A	9	10	8
Satisfactory	2	N/A	9	7	11
Developing	0	N/A	1	2	0
% E	89.5%	N/A	47.4%	52.6%	42.1%
%S	10.5%	N/A	47.4%	36.8%	57.9%
%D	0.0%	N/A	5.2%	10.6%	0.0%

n= 19

<i>Comprehensive</i>					
Exemplary	5	5	0	2	3
Satisfactory	0	0	4	3	2
Developing	0	0	1	0	0
% E	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
%S	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	60.0%	40.0%
%D	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%

n= 5



Student Services					
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
Exemplary	8	9	8	6	4
Satisfactory	7	5	6	8	11
Developing	0	1	1	0	0
% E	53.3%	60.0%	53.3%	42.9%	26.7%
%S	46.7%	33.3%	40.0%	57.1%	73.3%
%D	0.0%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%

n=15

Administration					
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
Exemplary	10	N/A	7	6	4
Satisfactory	5	N/A	4	6	8
Developing	0	N/A	4	3	3
% E	66.7%	N/A	46.7%	40.0%	26.7%
%S	33.3%	N/A	26.7%	40.0%	53.3%
%D	0.0%	N/A	26.7%	20.0%	20.0%

Student Services					
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
Exemplary	12	10	5	3	8
Satisfactory	3	4	6	11	6
Developing	0	1	4	1	1
% E	80.0%	66.7%	33.3%	20.0%	53.3%
%S	20.0%	26.7%	40.0%	73.3%	40.0%
%D	0.0%	6.7%	26.7%	6.7%	6.7%

n= 15

Administration					
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
Exemplary	10	N/A	5	2	2
Satisfactory	1	N/A	4	8	8
Developing	0	N/A	2	1	1
% E	90.9%	N/A	45.5%	18.2%	18.2%
%S	9.1%	N/A	36.4%	72.7%	72.7%
%D	0.0%	N/A	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%

**Appendix C: Updated for 2021-2022 Program Review Rubrics**  
**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Instructional Evaluation Rubric**  
(Revised 4/2021)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p>
<b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b>	<p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned.</p> <p>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p>	<p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment</p>

	<p>determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b></p>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or area.</p>	<p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current action status is unclear.</p> <p>The impact of the action was not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future.</p> <p>Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>
<p><b>Program Planning</b></p>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> <p>Planning actions are clearly based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Actions clearly show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions.</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p> <p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans.</p> <p>The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>

**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Administrative Services Evaluation Rubric**

(Revised 4/2021)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p>
<b>Data Analysis-General/Program Indicators</b>	<p>Data are complete and insightful.</p> <p>Commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are described in detail.</p> <p>Student equity data are thoroughly discussed.</p>	<p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program or discipline changes are present.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are clearly stated.</p> <p>Student equity data are discussed briefly.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or is unclear.</p> <p>Comparative analysis is absent or sparse regarding program or discipline changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning.</p> <p>Student equity data are not discussed or is unclear.</p>

<p><b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b></p>	<p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned.</p> <p>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b></p>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or discipline.</p>	<p>Current status of actions taken are clear.</p> <p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current action status is unclear.</p> <p>The impact of the action was not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future.</p> <p>Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>
<p><b>Program Planning</b></p>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p>



	<p>planning actions and are discussed.</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> <p>Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Planning actions clearly show the expected impact on the Program and discipline/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program or discipline and student success and can be measured.</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans.</p> <p>The impact of actions on program or discipline and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>
--	--	---	---



**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Student Services Evaluation Rubric**

(Revised 4/2021)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission/Program Information</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p>
<b>Data Analysis/Program Indicators</b>	<p>Data are complete and insightful; commentary is given regarding factors that may have contributed to program changes.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were described in detail.</p> <p>Student equity outcomes or initiatives were thoroughly addressed.</p>	<p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program changes were present.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were clearly states.</p> <p>Student equity was discussed.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or is unclear.</p> <p>Comparative analysis was absent or sparse regarding data, program changes, and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning.</p> <p>Student equity was not discussed or was unclear.</p>

<p><b>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</b></p>	<p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned.</p> <p>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation of Previous Plans</b></p>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or area.</p>	<p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described.</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current action status is unclear.</p> <p>The impact of the action was not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future.</p> <p>Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>
<p><b>Program Planning</b></p>	<p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p>



	<p>planning actions and are discussed.</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> <p>Planning actions are clearly based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Actions clearly show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p>	<p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p>	<p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans. The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>
--	---	---	--

**Program Review Committee  
Plan Ranking Rubric**

<b>Category</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>Medium (3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>High (5)</b>
<b>Necessary to achieve an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective</b>	Has no alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has minimal alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has small alignment with Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has moderate alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has considerable alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective	Has strong alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective
<b>Identified as a need based on assessment outcome(s)</b>	Has no link to assessment data	Has minor link to assessment data	Has some link to assessment data	Has moderate link to assessment data	Has considerable link to assessment data	Has strong link to assessment data
<b>Category</b>	<b>No (0)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>Medium (2)</b>	<b>High (3)</b>		
<b>Ranking by Program Review Authors</b>	Low Ranking	Low to mid ranking	Mid to high ranking	High ranking.		
<b>Number of students affected</b>	No students affected	Impacts students in single discipline affected	Impacts students in a specific division	Impacts students districtwide		
<b>Improved institutional efficiency</b>	Has no cost/benefit value	Has low cost/benefit value	Has moderate cost/benefit value	Has high cost/benefit value		
<b>Meets a safety or legislated mandate</b>	Has no link to safety or mandate	Has low or indirect link to safety or mandate	Has moderate link to safety or mandate	Has strong of direct link to safety or mandate.		
<b>Criticality of the request</b>	If unfunded there will be no disruption of service	If unfunded will have minor impact on service	If unfunded will have moderate impact on service	If unfunded will have major impact on service		