Institutional Effectiveness Program Review
2012-2013

1. Program Description

1A. Description

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness strives to promote student success and a culture of self evaluation and improvement by providing leadership for assessment of student learning outcomes, planning, program review, and the use of institutional research. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves Ventura College in the following areas:

Student Learning Outcomes
Strategic Planning
Institutional Research
Program Review
Accreditation

1B. Services Provided by the Program

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness oversees the college's integrated planning, which includes the program review process. The dean, who serves as co-chair for the college's SLO and College Planning committees, works with departments, department chairs, program and service supervisors or coordinators, and individual faculty and staff to provide training and support for the assessment of student learning outcomes/service unit outcomes, and program review.   The dean also serves as co-chair with the Academic Senate President of the College Planning Committee.

The program is responsible for creating or maintaining documentation needed to support accreditation activities, including student learning outcomes and program review. It is also responsible for ensuring that institutional data, in the form of an Institutional Effectiveness Report, is prepared, updated, readily available, and usable to the college community and other stakeholders. The Office coordinates and prepares reports (i.e. ARCC, BSI) required by various federal, state, district, and college departments.

1C. College Vision

Ventura College will be a model community college known for enhancing the lives and economic futures of its students and the community.

1D. College Mission

Ventura College, one of the oldest comprehensive community colleges in California, provides a positive and accessible learning environment that is responsive to the needs of a highly diverse student body through a varied selection of disciplines, learning approaches and teaching methods including traditional classroom instruction, distance education, experiential learning, and co-curricular activities. It offers courses in basic skills; programs for students seeking an associate degree, certificate or license for job placement and advancement; curricula for students planning to transfer; and training programs to meet worker and employee needs. It is a leader in providing instruction and support for students with disabilities. With its commitment to workforce development in support of the State and region's economic viability, Ventura College takes pride in creating transfer, career technical and continuing

education opportunities that promote success, develop students to their full potential, create lifelong learners, enhance personal growth and life enrichment and foster positive values for successful living and membership in a multicultural society. The College is committed to continual assessment of learning outcomes in order to maintain high quality courses and programs. Originally landscaped to be an arboretum, the College has a beautiful, park-like campus that serves as a vital community resource.

1E. Core Commitments

Ventura College is dedicated to following a set of enduring Core Commitments that shall guide it through changing times and give rise to its Vision, Mission and Goals.

- Student Success
- Respect
- Integrity
- Quality
- Collegiality
- Access
- Innovation
- Diversity
- Service
- Collaboration
- Sustainability
- Continuous Improvement

1F. Program Significant Events (Strengths and Successes)

Over the last year, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has worked on the following areas:

1) We have continued to respond to the accreditation recommendations from the 2010 site visit. Four of the recommendations were found to need additional work, and we have focused on completing that work prior to the November 2012 follow up visit.

2) We are entering the second cycle of our new program review process this semester. At the conclusion of the process last year, input was gathered from the department chairs and coordinators, members of the College Planning Council, members of the Administrative Council, and from an online survey. A process committee for program review (a subcommittee of the College Planning Council) during May to recommend changes to the program review process for the 2012/2013 cycle. These changes involved the use of facilitators at division meetings, consistency in the prioritization of initiatives, and additional program review meetings so that collaboration could occur within division on the creation of initiatives in addition to faculty and staff understanding each program review in the division more clearly. Initiatives created through program review are linked to data and the budgeting of resources.

3) The office is overseeing the third year of the current strategic planning cycle. Modifications to the objectives were proposed, revised, and then approved by the College Planning Council. The goals and objectives have clear links to board goals. Action steps have been developed for each

of the objectives and these action steps are updated by the office of Institutional Effectiveness on a regular basis.

4) Improvement continues to be made in the area of SLOs/SUOs. The Institutional/GE SLOs were revised by the SLO Committee and approved by the Academic Senate. Two ISUOs are in the process of being approved and will become part of the document. Pilots for ISLO and PSLO assessments were conducted during the spring 2012 semester, with presentations/training made to the department chairs and coordinators. This semester, all programs are assessing PSLOs and ISLOs; all departments are assessing ISLOs. A five-year rotational plan has been approved by the SLO Committee, and programs/departments/services are in the process of creating plans to assess all of their SLOs and SUOs within that timeframe. Rubrics have been created for written, oral, and visual communication, for scientific reasoning, and for quantitative reasoning (ISLOs #1 and 2). This five year plan allows for time for the campus to discuss and revise GE/ISLO rubrics, to discuss the results of assessment, and to make appropriate changes/improvements in instruction to ensure that our students graduating or transferring have these important skills.

5) TracDat was purchased for SLO management, program review, and strategic planning. Trainings for faculty and staff are ongoing. It will be used this semester for the PSLO, ISLO, and course assessments.

6) The SLO Implementation Report, with 63 pieces of evidence, was written by the dean of Institutional Effectiveness, with input from the SLO facilitators and the Academic Senate President. The report, which validates that proficient status of the college, was submitted to ACCJC on October 15, 2012 after review by the Academic Senate.

7) The Institutional Effectiveness Report was completed along with Core Indicators of Effectiveness, which were created by the College Planning Council. The core indicators link to the district indicato

8) The college applied for and was awarded a Title V HSI Grant with a focus on increased transfer velocity through improved institutional effectiveness. The funding provided by the grant will provide accelerated instruction in math and English, supplemental instruction for high risk barrier courses across the disciplines, a center for Reading/Writing across the curriculum, and an increased focus on student learning outcomes as a way to improve teaching and learning.

1G. Organizational Structure

President: Robin Calote
    Executive Vice President: Ramiro Sanchez
        Dean: Kathy Scott
                Institutional Researcher: Michael Callahan

Staff

Institutional Effectiveness Program Review
2012-2013

Name	Michael Callahan
Classification	Institutional Research Officer
Year Hired	
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	A.B., 1964, Rutgers University; M.B.A., 1982, Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo, CA

Name	Patricia Bergman
Classification	Administrative Assistant
Year Hired	
Year of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	AA, Ventura College

Name	Rachel Marchioni
Classification	Administrative Assistant
Year Hired	
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	BA, Communication, Cal State Long Beach

2. Performance Expectations

2A. Student Learning Outcomes

2A1. 2012-2013 - *Institutional* Student Learning Outcomes

1. Communication - written, oral and visual
2. Reasoning - Scientific and quantitative
3. Critical thinking and problem solving
4.   Information literacy
5. Personal/community awareness and academic/career responsibilities

2A2. 2012-2013 – *Program* Service Unit Outcomes

In Section 4, Assessment/Performance, the PSUOs from 2011/2012 have been assessed.

The PSUOs have been revised and are as follows. They will be assessed in the following cycle.

1. Continuously improve SLO and SUO assessment processes to increase student learning and student services (75% of faculty and staff will report in a survey that learning or service has improved as a result of SLO and SUO assessment data and associated changes).
2. Continuously improve the program review process so that it is meaningful for department and programs in their efforts to analyze data and improve programs, departments, and services (70% of programs and departments will report in a survey that the program review process and analysis of data helped them to create meaningful initiatives for improvement).
3. Work with the College Planning Council and other committees/groups to continuously improve the college's performance as it relates to the Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness (results of the Core Indicators Scorecard – see IE Report – will improve from the prior year).

2A3. 2012-2013 – *Program Operating* Outcomes

1. Provide useful and easily accessible data for program review
2.   Manage documentation in support of activities for strategic planning, student learning outcomes, program review, and the college's multi-year assessment plan.

3. Operating Information

3A. Budget Summary Tables, Trends, and Detail

Program specific data was provided in Section 3 for all programs last year. This year, please refer to the data sources available on the Program Review webpage (link will be provided).

In addition, the 2011-2012 program review documents will provide examples of last year's data and interpretations.

2012 - 2013 **Please provide program interpretation for the following:**

Interpretation of the Program Budget Information

Budget data shows funding for IE to be accurate. Last year $281 was budgeted for travel. However, no travel is currently budgeted for this year, and it is important that IE staff remain current with accreditation issues.

Interpretation of the Program Inventory Table

Institutional Effectiveness is a relatively new program, and no inventory shows on the list. The only equipment recently purchased has been a laptop, which was put into instructional equipment for the division as a whole.

Service Data:

a) *What populations are served by the program?*

> The population served by the program is the entire college, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students. The program supports all of these groups through its efforts with strategic planning, student learning outcomes and service unit oucomes, program review, and

the maintenance/creation of institutional data. Committees and services across campus – Basic Skills, Distance Ed, Learning Communities, Welcome Center, Assessment, etc. – are also served by the Institutional Researcher who creates reports as requested.

b) *How many students, classes, etc. have been served by the program over the last two years (per semester)?*

All disciplines and services across the campus were served by the program over the last two years. The program, through its SLO facilitators and SLO Committee, provides support to any individual, program, department, or service requesting assistance.

For SLOs, 98% of courses have identified SLOs. 85% of courses have ongoing assessments. All instructional and programs are on track for PSLO and ISLO assessments this semester. All departments are on track for ISLO assessments.

Last year, all instructional and service programs (except those on the discontinuance list that did not present a proposal for program continuation) completed program reviews. All divisions made program review presentations to the College Planning Council.

c) *What other operational data is pertinent to your program? Please provide.*

4. Performance Assessment

4A1: 2012-2013 Institutional Level Student Learning Outcomes

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 1	Performance Indicators
Communication	The program does not map to this ISLO.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Effectiveness Program Review
2012-2013

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 2	Performance Indicators
Reasoning	The program does not map to this ISLO.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 3	Performance Indicators
Critical Thinking and problem solving	The program does not map to this ISLO.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 4	Performance Indicators
Information Literacy	The program does not map to this ISLO.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 5	Performance Indicators
Personal/community awareness and academic / career responsibilities	The program does not map to this ISLO.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Note: The program maps to the ISUOs, which are currently under review by the SLO Committee.

4A2:   2011-2012 Service Unit Outcomes

Service Unit Outcome-1	Performance Indicators
Review, revise, and align institutional SLOs with program and course-level SLOs to ensure that the institution has cohesive instructional programs.	a. The SLO Committee/campus community will review/revise institutional SLOs. b. 85% of faculty/staff responding to a campus survey will support the quality and quantity of the revised institutional SLOs. c. 90% of programs will align program SLOs and, in the case of instructional programs, course-level SLOs to institutional SLOs.
Operating Information	
GE/ISLOs have been revised and approved. ISLOs are being assessed this semester.	
Analysis – Assessment	
"A" above was met. Plans are underway to utilize the new SLO rotational plan to ensure that campus dialogue occurs and is linked to continued improvement. "B" above was not met. No survey has yet been conducted. "C" above was not met. Approximately 75% of programs have completed mapping.	

Service Unit Outcome-2	Performance Indicators
Implement and improve new program review process.	a. 95% of programs will complete new program review process in Fall 2011. b. Office of IE will evaluate program reviews to ensure quality of work and connection between program-level SLOs, findings, initiatives, and requests for initiatives. c. 75% of resource requests are linked to SLO/SUO processes for the improvement of student learning and services. d. 80% of programs will feel that they were provided with satisfactory program data to make informed decisions.
Operating Information	
All programs (except those on the discontinuance list who did not make a presentation to maintain the program) completed program review.	
Analysis – Assessment	

"A" was met.

"B" was partially met. Division deans evaluated program reviews in their areas to ensure quality. With TracDat, we hope to be able to track initiatives more easily in the future.

"C" was met. Except for emergency situations (or situations that could not have been known ahead of time), equipment, technology, and staffing requests went through the program review process and the analysis of data.

"D" – Not met. 55.6% of instructional areas and 63.2% of service areas believed that they were provided with sufficient data.

Service Unit Outcome-3	Performance Indicators
Through the SLO/SUO process, the office will support faculty and staff in their efforts to continuously improve learning and services to students.	a. Assist programs to develop a multi-year assessment plan. b. Oversee and track SLO/SUO process to ensure that 90% of service programs and instructional areas are assessing student learning outcomes according to their identified multi-year assessment plan. c. With SLO/SUO facilitators, review quality of work produced by programs. d. Survey faculty and staff annually to assess whether the office of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO facilitators are providing satisfactory service and responding to program needs. e. Ensure that 85% of programs are "closing the loop" – implementing program-identified changes to improve learning and services.
Operating Information	
A rotational plan for SLOs/SUOs has been developed. Careful tracking SLO and SUO assessments and closing the loop continues.	
Analysis – Assessment	
"A" – Partially met. The SLO/SUO rotational plan was not approved until recently, so the multi-year assessment plans are not done. However, approximately 70% of programs have completed mapping. "B" – Partially met. Approximately 95% of service programs have ongoing assessments. 85% of instructional programs have ongoing assessments. "C" – Partially met. SLO facilitors continue to work with instructional faculty and service faculty/staff to improve quality of assessments and initiatives. "D" – Met. The campus is surveyed regarding SLOs every year. "E" - Not met. Approximately 70% of programs are "closing the loop," which is a big improvement over the prior year. The goal of 85% was probably too high at this point.	

Service Unit Outcome-4	Performance Indicators
Faculty and staff will know how to access institutional data, will utilize it for program planning purposes, and will find it effective for their needs.	a. 70% of faculty and staff will be aware of institutional data and how to access it online. b. 50% of faculty and staff will make decisions and plan programs based on institutional data. c. Office of IE will add additional research components or further disaggregate data to meet the needs of faculty and staff.

Operating Information
The Institutional Effectiveness Report was completed, in its entirely, including a new section on Core Indicators of Effectiveness during the spring 2012 semester.

Analysis – Assessment
"A" – Goal met. While a survey was not done, the IE report was made known to faculty and staff through updates from the president, at a presentation on mandatory flex day, and to members of the College Planning Council where various portions of the IE report were discussed during the 2011/2012 academic year. "B" – Goal met. Faculty and staff make decisions about instruction based on SLO and SUO assessments. "C" – Goal met. The office of IE is responsive to various areas of the college requesting data. For example, he has made data about transfer available to various departments such as art, has completed reports for Distance Ed, for Basic Skills (including a report that was used by the entire campus in this regard on mandatory flex day), for Learning Communities, the Welcome Center, etc. He also continues to track objectives on two HSI grants.

Service Unit Outcome	Performance Indicators
Program processes (i.e. student learning outcomes, program review) will be aligned with the college's mission, educational master plan, and strategic plan to ensure that the institution's goals are being met.	a. Provide support for campus community to review and, if appropriate, revise the college mission. b. Ensure that the educational master plan and the strategic plan are aligned to the mission. c. Ensure that program review and student learning outcomes processes are aligned to the educational master plan and strategic plan.

Operating Information
The college mission statement has been the topic of two college forums. The strategic plan for 2012/2013 was approved by the College Planning Council.

Analysis – Assessment

"A" – Goal met. The college mission, which is scheduled for review in fall 2012, is on track for revision and has been discussed extensively. The latest version will be presented to the College Planning Council this semester.

"B" – Not met. Mission statement under review.

"C" – Goal met. For 2012/2013, program review and student learning outcomes processes are linked to the strategic plan.

4C. 2012-2013 Program Operating Outcomes

Operating Goal-1	Performance Indicators
Provide useful and easily accessible data for program review	a. 80% of faculty and staff will find program review data easily accessible and useful for analysis. b. 70% will be aware of how to access other IE data (i.e Institutional Effectiveness Report)
Operating Information	
We are in the process of putting program review onto TracDat.	
Analysis – Assessment	
"A" – Not met. Program review data is not currently in a format that is easily accessible for most faculty. At a recent department chairs and coordinators meeting, approximately 50% of participants reported not being able to find or analyze it easily in its current form "B" – Survey not completed. However, the college community is made aware of institutional data from numerous sources: updates from the president, other emails, college forums, and presentations on mandatory flex day.	

Operating Goal-2	Performance Indicators
Manage documentation in support of activities for strategic planning, student learning outcomes, program review, and the college's multi-year assessment plan.	A functioning software system for student learning outcomes, program review, and strategic planning is in place and functioning satisfactorily for 80% of faculty and staff.
Operating Information	
TracDat was purchased in Spring 2012. Training occurred during the summer of 2012 for primary users. Department chairs and service leaders have been trained. Ongoing training is occurring for faculty and other groups of employees.	
Analysis – Assessment	
Partially met. Software system was purchased, but it is too soon to survey faculty about its usefulness.	

5. Findings

2012-2013 - FINDINGS

Finding 1: The college continues to improve in the quantity and quality of its SLO and SUO assessment processes.   Work needs to continue to ensure that SLOs at the institutional, program, and course levels are aligned.

Finding 2: The program review process similarly continues to improve each semester. Work, in this area, needs to continue.

Finding 3: Program review data is not sustainable in its current form.

Finding 4: The college has done well in aligning its mission, educational master plan, strategic plan, student learning outcomes, and program review processes. Work in this area needs to continue.

Finding 5: While TracDat is in place for SLOs and faculty/staff are using it, TracDat needs to be extended to program review and strategic planning.

6. Initiatives

6A: 2011-2012 - FINAL Program Initiative Priority Ratings

Program	Category	Program Priority (0, 1, 2, 3...)	Division Priority (R,H,M,L)	Committee Priority (R, H, M, L)	College Priority (R, H, M, L)	Initiative ID	Initiative Title	Resource Description	Estimated Cost	Adjusted Cost	Accumulated Costs	Full Time or Part Time
Institutional Effectiveness	None	0				IE1203	Align SLOs	Align student learning outcomes/service unit outcomes at the institutional, program, and course levels.			-	
Institutional Effectiveness	None	0				IE1205	Improve student learning and services	Continued improvement of student learning and services through the SLO/SUO process.			-	
Institutional Effectiveness	None	0				IE1206	Improve program review process	Improve program review process with input from campus community			-	
Institutional Effectiveness	None	0				IE1207	Institutional data	Faculty and staff will be access and utilize institutional data for their needs			-	
Institutional Effectiveness	None	0				IE1208	Align program processes with mission, educational master plan and strategic plan	Program processes (i.e. student leraning outcomes, program review) will be aligned with the college's mission, educational master plan, and strategic plan to ensure that the institution's goals are met		3,000	3,000	
Institutional Effectiveness	Technology	1	H	M	M	IE1202	SLO/SUO Data Management	TracDat software that supports planning, budgeting, and accreditation	35,800	-	3,000	
Institutional Effectiveness	Budget	1	H		M	IE1202	SLO/SUO Data Management	Annual Maintenance	6,468	6,468	9,468	
Institutional Effectiveness	Technology	2	H	H	H	IE1204	Program Review Databases and Consultant	Databases and consultant to support Program Review management	20,000	-	9,468	
Institutional Effectiveness	Personnel	3	H		M	IE1201	Clerical Support	40% replacement for Hilda Ruiz, Support SLO effort and schedule	16,253	16,253	25,721	

6B: **2012-2013** **Initiatives**

Initiative ID should be consistent. For example:
2011-2012 identified initiatives - LC1201, LC1202, etc.
2012-2013 identified initiatives – LC1301, LC1302, etc.

These initiatives are being included for your reference. If they still apply in 2012-13 keep them on. If they do not, delete them. Add any new initiative for 2012-13.

Initiative: Align student learning outcomes/service unit outcomes at the institutional, program, and course levels.
Initiative ID: IE1203
Link to Finding #1: Some programs/departments have mapped outcomes at the various levels. Others are still in the process of doing so.
Benefits: If these student learning outcomes/service unit outcomes are aligned, faculty, staff, and students are more easily able to understand the importance of learning at each level.
Request for Resources: None
Funding Sources:

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	X
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative : TracDat implementation
Initiative ID: IE1301
Link to Finding #5: TracDat implementation for program review and strategic planning is needed.
Benefits: Managing the various accreditation and planning processes (SLOs, program review, and strategic planning) with TracDat will streamline these processes.
Request for Resources: None
Funding Sources:

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	X
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative : Program Review databases

Initiative ID: IE1302

Link to Finding #3: Provide accessible program review data

Benefits: With more accessible data, faculty and staff will be able to complete their program reviews more easily and be able to focus more of their time/energy on the analysis of data, dialogue, and the creation of initiatives for improvement.

Request for Resources: $10,000 in Institutional researcher time

Funding Sources:

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	X
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative : Continued improvement of student learning and services through the SLO/SUO processes.

Initiative ID: IE1303

Link to Finding #1: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness needs to continue to support faculty and staff as they continue to collect assessment data, create initiatives, and implement changes to improve instruction and services.

Benefits: The institution will continue to improve its instruction and services.

Request for Resources: None

Funding Sources:

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	X
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative : Improve program review process

Initiative ID: IE1304

Link to Finding #3: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness needs to gather input from the 2012/2013 academic year about the program review process from various groups and revise the process accordingly.

Benefits: The process and product will be more useful to the programs and the institution.

Request for Resources: None

Funding Sources:

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	X

Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative : Professional Development
Initiative ID: IE1305
Link to Finding #3: There is no budget for professional development for IE staff
Benefits: IE staff should remain current with accreditation expectations and current trends in student success
Request for Resources: $3,000
Funding Sources: Title V individual grant

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	X

6C: 2012-2013 Program Initiative Priority Ratings

Program	Category	Program Priority (0,1,2,3)	Division Priority (R,H,M,L)	Committee Priority	College Priority	Initiative ID	Initiative Title	Resource Description	Estimated Cost	Adjusted Cost	Accumulated Costs	Personnel	FT OR PT
	No funding		H			IE1203	Align SLOs			0			
	No funding		H			IE1301	TracDat Implementation			0			
	Gen Fund		H			IE1302	Sustainable program review data			$10,000			
	No funding		H			IE1303	Continued improvement of SLO/SUO processes			0			
	No funding		H			IE1304	Continued improvement of program review			0			
	Grant/Other		M			IE1305	Professional Development			$3,000			

6D: Program/Department Level Initiative Prioritization

All initiatives will first be prioritized by the program/department staff. Prioritize the initiatives using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

Division Level Initiative Prioritization

The program initiatives within a division will be consolidated into division spreadsheets. The dean may include additional division-wide initiatives. All initiatives will then be prioritized using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

Committee Level Initiative Prioritization

The division's spreadsheets will be prioritized by the appropriate college-wide committees (staffing, technology, equipment, facilities) using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

College Level Initiative Prioritization

Dean's will present the consolidated prioritized initiatives to the College Planning Council. The College Planning Council will then prioritize the initiatives using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

R: Required – mandated or unavoidable needs (litigation, contracts, unsafe to operate conditions, etc.).

H: High – approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category (personnel, equipment, etc.)

M: Medium – approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category (personnel, equipment, etc.)

L: Low – approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category (personnel, equipment, etc.)

7. Process Assessment and Appeal

7A. Purpose of Process Assessment

The purpose of program review assessment is to evaluate the process for continual improvement. The process is required for accreditation and your input is very important to us as we strive to improve.

7B. 2012 - 2013 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Did you complete the program review process last year, and if so, did you identify program initiatives?

Yes, program initiatives were developed and one was funded. One unfunded initiative remains on the list for this year.

2a. Were the identified initiatives implemented?

IE1203	Alignment of SLOs	Many departments/programs completed this work in spring 2012 but some remains to be done. Mapping also needs to be put onto TracDat.
IE1202	SLO/SUO data management	TracDat was purchased. Faculty and staff have been or are being trained. Reports are being generated, and the inputting of information is significantly easier. The ability to track initiatives will continue to improve.
IE1204	Program Review Database	Sustainable program review data remains unresolved and has been moved to a new initiative
IE1201	Clerical Support	The college received a new Title V grant and has hired a new administrative assistant to assist with IE.
IE1205	Improvement of SLO and SUO processes	SLO facilitators continue to work with faculty and staff.
IE1206	Improve program review processes	The process was revised for this year based on input from campus committees and an electronic survey. The process will be evaluated again this year and additional changes made.
IE1207	Institutional data	The Institutional Effectiveness Report is complete and the campus community has been made aware via several methods of how to access it. IE data is regularly shared

		with the College Planning Council.
IE1208	Integration of planning processes	The college continues to align its processes and will continue to do so.

2b. Did they make a difference?

TracDat has made an emormous difference in the way SLO/SUO data is input, accountability occurs, and reports are run (i.e. to show status of initiatives).

3. If you appealed or presented a minority opinion for the program review process last year, what was the result?

No appeals or minority opinions were put forth.

4. How have the changes in the program review process worked for your area?

We benefitted from the use of a facilitator. The process seemed much smoother and easier with everyone in the division participating.

5. How would you improve the program review process based on this experience?

Sustainable program review data is crucial.

We need to encourage all faculty and staff to participate.

7C. Appeals

After the program review process is complete, your program has the right to appeal the ranking of initiatives.

If you choose to appeal, please complete the appropriate form that explains and supports your position. Forms are located at the Program Review VC website.

The appeal will be handled at the next higher level of the program review process.