



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2012 Program Review Report

A. Last Year's Initiatives

EAC Program: Last year we planned to expand ways in which students can notify EAC that they will need a testing accommodations appointment. Since then, we established an email account that students can use to make the testing appointment so a phone call is not necessary. An initiative that was funded consisted of a backup system for the alternative media specialist and this is ensuring that many years of work making text books accessible to students will not be lost.

EAC Instructional: In the ACT initiative, it was cited that this population of students need more individualized support during instruction. This initiative is still active since there has not been a position available. In the EAC (adapted PE) class it was determined that activities leading up to supporting assignments and activities needed revision. This could only be accomplished when new equipment could be purchased. This initiative now can be revised since new equipment was purchased for this class.

B. Updates/accomplishments pertaining to any of the Student Success or Operating Goals from last year's report.

Section II - Description

A. Description of Program/Department

The Educational Assistance Center (EAC) promotes the educational and vocational potential of students with disabilities by supporting each student's integration into the mainstream of college life. Students with learning disabilities, mobility, visual, hearing, speech, or psychological impairments, acquired brain injuries, or other health impairments, such as seizure disorders or attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, are eligible for support services and special classes that are needed to fully participate in the educational process. Support services and specialized instruction are provided by the EAC and it is above and beyond the regular services or instruction offered by the college. These classes, activities or services are offered to enable the student with an educational limitation resulting from a disability to fully benefit in the offerings of the college.

B. Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes), and Accomplishments

Over the past year, there has been little change however this academic year we have already experienced some change. Starting this fall, the section of classes taught in the EAC was cut. Both full time instructors lost their overload class sections and the part time



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

instructor was laid off. (Thankfully this did not happen in the adapted PE area.) The EAC is receiving an additional \$110,000 (unsure of exact amount) from the State to help alleviate the cut in categorical programs from the previous years. With this increase, EAC is planning to hire a full time counselor to start January, 2014. And, we are in conversation with administrators to bring back Learning Disability Assessment which was suspended fall of 2011. If we are able to start re-assessing, we would like to be able to hire a full time LD specialist.

C. College Vision

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

D. College Mission

At Ventura College, we transform students' lives, develop human potential, create an informed citizenry, and serve as the educational and cultural heart of our community. Placing students at the center of the educational experience, we serve a highly diverse student body by providing quality instruction and student support, focusing on associate degree and certificate completion, transfer, workforce preparation, and basic skills. We are committed to the sustainable continuous improvement of our college and its services.

E. College 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
- Innovation
- Respect
- Diversity
- Integrity
- Service
- Quality
- Collaboration
- Collegiality
- Sustainability
- Access
- Continuous Improvement

F. Organizational Structure

President: Greg Gillespie **Executive Vice President:**

Dean: Victoria Lugo

Coordinator: Patricia Wendt

Name	Patricia Wendt
Classification	Professor, EAC/Counseling/Coordinator
Year Hired	2001
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., 1993, M.S., 1995, California State University, Fresno



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Name	Tom Dalton
Classification	Professor, Learning Disabilities
Year Hired	2004
Year of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., 1979, Taylor University, Indiana; M.A., 1983, Psy.D., 1986, Biola University, California

Name	Steven Turner
Classification	Professor, EAC
Year Hired	2000
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., 1988, California State University, Fresno; M.S., 1999, San Diego State University

Name	Lori Annala
Classification	Support Services Assistant
Year Hired	2000
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	A.A., Ventura College

Name	John Elmer
Classification	Assistive Computer Technician/Media Specialist
Year Hired	2001
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., University of Wisconsin M.S., University of Wisconsin

Name	Cathy Mundy
Classification	Disabled Student Services Technician
Year Hired	1993
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., CSU Northridge

Name	John Bundy
Classification	Adjunct Adapted PE instructor, EAC
Year Hired	2012
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	M.S., CSU Northridge



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Name	Warren Glasser
Classification	Adjunct Adapted Physical Education Instructor, EAC
Year Hired	1972-83, 1998
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., 1961 University of Santa Barbara

Name	Nancy Coleman
Classification	Adjunct EAC Counselor
Year Hired	2011
Years of Industry Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., 1979 California State University, Northridge M.S., 2001 San Diego State University

Section IIIa – Data and Analysis

A. SUO Data & SLO Data

- SUO Data for the EAC Program:** Note taking is an accommodation that EAC offers some students. Over the past few years student have voiced frustration over the quality of notes that are received, the lack of volunteers that will participate in note taking, and the lack of visual data that an instructor uses as a teaching modality. We surveyed students at the end of the semester to see how we can improve this accommodation. From this survey, we had discussions about how we can improve this service without involving funding resources. We pretty much came to the conclusion that communication needs to be happening between the student and EAC if unsatisfactory notes/lack of note taker is a problem for the student. During the authorization process, students were told to keep EAC informed if they were not able to find a note taker, hoping this would help the process. So far this semester, students are returning and communicating needs and then allowing us to collaborate with instructor and come up with alternative solutions. The EAC rotational plan for SUO does allow us this year a break. However, we may revisit an outcome that we were planning for last year involving alternative media production.
- SLO Data for ACT, CDL, LS and EAC classes:** Students have been meeting measured objectives at a very high rate across the board. As always, the rubric is always a challenge for LS classes. Not only is there the diversity as seen campus wide, but there is the added diversity of various disabilities. The level of cognitive functioning, the severity of impairment, and general nature of disability varies greatly making it difficult to clearly represent the progress of individuals as opposed to the progress of an entire class. There has also been an increase in students with no identified disability attending these classes as well as an increase in students with suspected disabilities, primarily LD, that has not been identified making it challenging to offer the most effective intervention and instruction based on known limitations.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

The quest for a better rubric is continual. The benefits of more general measures versus very specific measures are open for debate. Depending on the nature of the rubric, there is a tendency to make it appear that nearly all students are operating at or above competency levels, or the majorities are not meeting that level of competency. This relates back to the diverse nature of the students attending.

The goal would be to not just change the rubric but to also change how instruction takes place. There could be greater attention given to isolated skills rather than losing them in measure that looks at the larger project. For example, attention could be given to constructing an outline or an introductory paragraph specifically rather than including these as part of the larger project of writing an essay.

Rubrics are being re-evaluated and more attention is being given to teaching more specific skills. There is also a greater emphasis on having students identify and verbalize what helps them learn best. This enables them to more intentionally study and prepare in a way that works for them. It also helps them ask for assistance in specific and relevant ways.

All these have been addressed and we have a clear understanding of the schedule for ongoing assessment.

The Assistive Computer Technology classes have maintained high success and retention rates. However, from what we have discovered from Student Learning Outcome results securing more individualized help for students will enhance all areas toward achieving learning outcomes. Some of the key changes we made to better serve the vast diversity of need in the A C T classes was to heavily recruit work-study and other student workers to assist on a more individualized basis are incredibly varied skill level of students. However due to budgetary constraints those students workers have been few and far between, and the consistency of instruction, as well as training, continuity has been very challenging. The strategies of utilizing cost-effective assistants seem to only be a Band-Aid for a chronic and systemic issue with our instruction. The more permanent and effective solution would be to have part-time classified instructional lab technician and or supplemental instruction to help facilitate a more proactive learning environment. The more permanent and effective solution would be to have part-time classified instructional lab technician and or supplemental instruction to help facilitate a more proactive learning environment. Over the last year of so, I have been able to collaborate with the human services certificate instructor and get some wonderful volunteers that have been able to assist in the Assistive Technology Training Center classes. Community volunteers have also helped to fill the void. It appears that all S L O mapping, rationale plan and other data for the Assistive Computer Technology classes have been useful in further justifying the need for Assistive Computer Technology across the curriculum. Whether accessing the VCCCD portal or simply navigating a Microsoft Word documents an increasing number of students lacks computer literacy. Learning outcomes with regard to safe and ergonomically sound computer use have been achieved, but tremendous amounts of energy are put into assisting students' access basic skills, such as reading, writing and time management.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

B. Operating Data (EAC Program)

1. Service Data

Students with verified learning, visual, hearing, speech, mobility and psychological disabilities, acquired brain injuries, developmental delays, autism, attention deficit disorders, as well as other health impairments, are eligible to receive services from the EAC. Reports have not been generated to break down the populations into ethnicities.

Many students are referred to EAC for possible disabilities, many students come to the EAC reporting disabilities, and many of these referrals are not counted in the number below due to not qualifying or providing verification to EAC. There are also many students that take the classes offered by EAC (ACT, LS) that don't register (complete intake and submit documentation) in the EAC so we can't get funding for them.

Students that had verified disabilities:

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
ABI Primary	43	60	38	32	41
Secondary	1	1	0	0	0
DD Primary	40	39	32	23	17
Secondary	2	3	2	1	3
HI Primary	25	26	25	17	23
Secondary	1	1	1	3	1
LD Primary	366	320	255	216	158
Secondary	4	4	3	2	2
Mob Primary	114	98	93	105	105
Secondary	28	24	20	20	23
OH Primary	384	393	486	527	531
Secondary	80	71	71	78	81
Psyd Primary	143	143	143	180	191
Secondary	65	61	61	72	102
Spch Primary	5	6	11	13	18
Secondary	2	7	7	7	8
VD Primary	30	30	29	28	24
Secondary	2	1	2	3	1
Total Primary	1150	1115	1112	1141	1108
Total Secondary	185	173	167	186	221



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Classes/Sections:

2011-2012:	Summer	3
	Fall	18
	Spring	18
2012-2013	Summer	3
	Fall	17
	Spring	18

Other Operational Data: Being that EAC is a categorical program, we have to complete an End of the Year Report (EOY) each year. This report identifies how we spent every dollar that the State and College gave the program. This report is matched up with the MIS report, the number of students that EAC served and what disability type each student had, and then from both these reports the State determines the amount of funding that EAC will receive. The formula which the funding uses is very complicated however our funding basically is determined by the number of students that we serve (based on disability code) and the college effort, the amount of college funding that is provided above the categorical funding. From looking at these reports we have two major concerns: one, the loss of college effort and two, the continued decrease in LD (learning disability) students due to not having LD assessment available. We have established an initiative that could help both these concerns, hiring a full time LD specialist who could perform the LD assessment. The LD specialist position would be considered college effort and this person would be completing LD assessment thus increasing the number of students that could be funded under this category.

2. Budget

The program budget information given in this report is inaccurate. EAC has 2 budgets. The categorical budget, which supports the EAC center and comes directly from the State, is the 121. The instruction budget, which supports classes (EAC, ACT, CDL and LS) and comes directly from the college budget, is the 111. Below is the correct data that I gathered from Banner reports. Both budgets have been shrinking for the past few years. The 111 budget has been reduced due to cut in sections that EAC/LS/ACT offer as well as only covering instruction and the mandated match of interpreter costs. This past year the college agreed to put the money that was being used for part time/overload classes that were cancelled into the Provisional to help with the cost of interpreting. This increases the 111 budget which will also help with college effort. The 121 budget from the state has been smaller mostly due to EAC not being allowed to assess students for a learning disability. We have lost tremendous amounts of money in this area since our allocation model pays for students per disability category and we have been losing in this category. Also, when our classes (FTES) are reduced this effects the amount of college effort that EAC 121 budget receives from the state. However this year, the EAC program is receiving an additional \$102,000 to help restore funding from the cuts that happened a few years ago. We have already been approved to hire a full time counselor for the EAC with this increase of funds. It is hoped that this person will start January 1, 2014.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

	<u>FY:11</u>	<u>FY:12</u>	<u>FY:13</u>	<u>FY:14</u>
Budget 111	\$403,851	\$425,984	\$372,993	\$416,422
Budget 121	\$653,264	\$626,102	\$539,391	\$615,292

- Program members have reviewed the budget data.
- No comments or requests to make about the budget

C. Performance Data (Classes)

1. Retention-Program and Course

The EAC program does not have retention data for EAC students and how they fare in their classes. It would be nice to have a breakdown of our specific students and use this data to compare it to the college as a whole. This will be an initiative that we present.

The retention rate for LS classes overall has been very consistent with the rate of the college – 86%. One LS has class (LS-V02) has had a retention rate 10% lower than the program and college average. An interesting observation is that some classes offered less frequently or that haven't been offered for several years were running higher retention rates. In particular, the shorter classes (often late-start) classes were at 100% retention. The retention rate for LS classes has been consistent overall for the past 3 years. All ethnic groups appear to be represented in LS classes consistent with the distribution of the college as a whole. Retention rates for African Americans were lowest of all ethnic groups in all LS classes. I did not have data to track such a trend. Ethnicity data was only for FY13. As compared to the whole college – yes. On one hand, I would expect to see a higher retention rate for LS classes because of the smaller size and more individualized attention. I would hope to see higher retention rates campus wide including in our program. Perhaps retention could be improved if students' disability and limitations were better defined. In particular, the students with LD are not being assessed and therefore it is difficult to develop appropriate strategies, interventions, and accommodations. Were we better able to do so, one would expect a higher success rate.

Most of the Assistive Computer Technology classes struggle to find the right mix of delivery, engagement and facilitation to keep up with college-level retention and success rates. The students that attend often deal with medical and transportation barriers to attend class at times. Specifically, over the last three years, the A C T classes have 86% retention rates. There are no gaps, we reflect the same ethnic breakdown as the college as a whole. The retention rates meet the expectation.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

2. Success-Program and Course

The EAC program does not have data of the success rate of our students in classes. It would nice to have this data and compare it to the general student population. This will be an initiative that we present. In 3 of the LS classes (LS-V02, LS-V14, & LS-V25), African Americans had significantly lower Success rates than any other ethnicity. The data available didn't allow for comparison of multiple years, only FY13. The success rates are of LS students might be expected to be lower than the college as a whole because of the obstacles to learning many are facing. They in fact seem to be succeeding at rate consistent with the entire campus. We need to be providing assessment of students to determine if they have LD. While the A C T classes have enjoyed 70% success rates and they continue to grow in popularity, it is clear that more individualized instruction with enhance success rates. There does not seem to be an indication of a trend.

3. Demographics-Program and Courses

The EAC program does not have access to the demographics of the student that we serve. We keep track of the number of students and the type of disability but it would be good to have further information. It would also be nice to track our students more closely when it comes to those who obtain a certificate or degree as well. This will be an initiative that we present.

The students enrolled in the LS classes represent the same diversity and the same proportions as diversity of the college as a whole. The percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in LS classes has increased nearly 10% since 2010. This mirrors the increase in the percentage of Hispanic students campus wide, nearly exactly. The classes reflect diversity to the extent that the campus has diversity. What is not reflected in the data is diversity of students based on ability/disability – only ethnic and gender. Have campus researcher provide more details about the demographics of disabled students as a group and compare to campus. Provide assessment of students to determine if they have LD. All ACT classes reflect an open and cultural diverse environment and consequently the demographic data is consistent with college population in age and ethnicity. No significant difference exists when compared to the college demographics.

4. Productivity-Program and Courses

The enrollment/productivity ratios are nearly at or above the district goal. LS-V10 was at 90% of goal in FY13. In response we decided to offer it only one semester per school year. There continues to be demand for the class but perhaps not every semester. No initiative seems necessary at this time. LS-V07 consistently exceeds the District goal by 50 to 75 points. This may be an indication that another section be opened because of high demand.

All ACT classes have achieved productivity goals across the board. The productivity ratios meet expectations possibly due to lowering our class capacity to 20 in ACT. Improvement can be made with consistent student workers, Supplemental Instruction and ILT help, the potential for increased enrollment is also possible.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

D. Resources

1. Faculty (Instructional and Non-Instructional)

In the last three years three we have lost instructional part time faculty due to the reduced sections of course offerings and the suspension of LD assessment. With the reduction of sections in LS classes, students are not getting the remediation that is needed. When students successfully pass these classes, they can advance into general education classes with stronger basics thus helping retention and success rates. This also is true for students who have undiagnosed learning issues. Once it is diagnosed, students can use accommodations to help with general education classes. We also lost a part time counselor due to the lack of funding. When making an appointment, students will wait on average 2-3 weeks before they can see a counselor. This becomes a problem when a student needs an accommodation and we are not able to serve them in a timely manner, which can lead to an Office of Civil Rights complaint against the college. We have already requested a full time counselor position with the increase funding of DSPS budget and are waiting for the green light to get the announcement out. Hopefully, we will have a new counselor begin January 1, 2014 using categorical funds only. We will be requesting through program review a new Learning Disability Specialist who can teach classes and perform learning disability assessments.

2. Classified Staff

Over the past 3 years the number of classified staff has remained constant. However, previous to those years, the EAC lost 4 full time classified positions. Now that we have more funding in both budgets, it has been determined that EAC greatest need at this time is to have a part time Instructional Learning Technician to assist with the ACT classes.

3. Inventory

After reviewing the inventory of EAC offices I found it to be very confusing and lacking in detail. The EAC is grouped as ADMN and the previous ADMN grouping is done by office numbers. However, EAC's 9 separate offices, big office space, work room and testing room are not separated into details of each room. There are items placed randomly on the pages and it is confusing to what room the items belong in.

4. Facilities or other Resource Requests

N/A



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

5. Combined Initiatives

In the Data and Analysis (Retention, Success, Demographics) portion of this report it was noted that the EAC program does not have statistical data about EAC students in classes. We would like this information to compare it to the general college population and also to see if the accommodations used are helping the student achieve success.

Section IIIb – Other Program Goals and Initiatives

A. Other Program Goals

Most all of our program goals for this report have already been discussed in previous pages. The only area that was not addressed was in regards to our Advisory Board (Title V mandated). We meet yearly and during the past meetings, concern about the lack of funding that the college provides to the EAC was discussed. Also, suspension of LD assessment was also a concern for this group and it was noted that when a new leadership is in place, EAC would then pursue the reinstating of LD assessment.

- *Innovation*
- *Legislation*
- *Regulations*
- *Industry Standards*
- *New Technology*
- *Professional Development*
- *Advisory Committee Recommendations*

Section IV - Initiatives

Ranking:

The ranking provided below indicated the program/department's ranking. The initiatives will be ranked again later at the division level before going to the appropriate committees (i.e. technology) for additional ranking.

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

M = Medium – Approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiative by resource category

L = Low – Approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

List your initiatives below, including any you are carrying forward from prior years. Please note that every program/department needs to include initiatives that do not require resources. You may copy and paste this section

Learning Disability Specialist:

In addition to their role in assessing students' eligibility for services as a student with a learning disability in the CCC system, LD Specialists are responsible for review of assessment results from sources outside the CCC. They review and evaluate outside assessments in terms of whether that assessment information meets specified system criteria for the definition of LD and to advise how the outside assessments relate to the student's educational goals. With this information, they make recommendations for appropriate accommodations and compensatory strategies.

An accurate and complete analysis of LD documentation is extremely important as students move through the higher education system. Students with documented learning disabilities make up the largest cohort of students with disabilities nationwide, as well as, the majority of students in DSPS programs and, therefore, generate a significant portion of the weighted student count. Given the current budget climate, many colleges have suspended LD Eligibility Determinations. When Learning Disabilities Specialists are unavailable to perform testing to determine LD eligibility, only students who can afford to pay for outside LD testing are able to be accurately identified as learning disabled. Based on the demographics of most California Community Colleges, these are not the typical students. Despite this unfortunate circumstance, DSPS programs are continuing to serve students to ensure they receive disability-related accommodations and services to support their student success through use of the "Other Disabilities" reporting category.

A. Initiative: Learning Disability Specialist Position

Initiative ID: EAC 1301

Link to Data: SLO Data, Service Data, Budget Data, Retention Data, and Success Data

Expected Benefits: Increase funding for EAC, increase in success and retention rates in classes, and offering more class sections in LS classes.

Goal: Class sections will be added back to class schedule and students will be assessed for learning disabilities. This will be a positive addition when working to implement the student success initiative in the next year.

Performance Indicator: Two class sections added and 75 student assessed for LD.

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: Staffing Funds

Ranking: H



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

B. Initiative: Instructional Learning Technician I (.4)

Initiative ID: EAC 1302

Link to Data: SLO Data and Productivity

Expected Benefits: This population of students needs also include more individualized support and instruction. It is hopeful that increase in student success can be obtained.

Goal: Effective and efficient instructional delivery will improve upon student learning outcomes.

Performance Indicator: A 5% increase of student success

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: Staffing Funds

Ranking: M

C. Initiative: Obtain statistical data on EAC students

Initiative ID: 1303

Link to Data: Service data, retention data, success data, and demographic data

Expected Benefits: Obtaining this information could be very helpful for the EAC program. This could validate the accommodations that are provided, show that there may be more services that EAC could provide, and show how EAC students do when compared to the general student population in various areas/classes.

Goal: Have institutional research conducted on EAC students.

Performance Indicator: Data will be collected on EAC students.

Timeline: 2015-2016

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: H



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

D. Initiative: Increasing the number of EAC students

Initiative ID: EAC 1304

Link to Data: Service Data for the EAC

Expected Benefits: There are many students that qualify for EAC services however they fail to register with EAC. Increasing the number of EAC students helps increase the funding that the State allocates to the program, thus increasing services that can be provided. Providing more services to students may increase student success and retention for classes.

Goal: Increase EAC student count

Performance Indicator: 5% increase each year

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: M

Section V – Process Assessment

Instructions: Please answer the following questions:

A. How have the changes in the program review process this year worked for your area?

I really like the condensed pages of the program review this year. It was still a bit chaotic due to having to prepare both a service and instructional program review in the given format. I had asked for assistance with the format however no help was given. I moved some areas around and added additional bullet points so hopefully this format is acceptable.

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

It seems that the Program Review process is necessary for the requests of “things” that a department needs. When requesting or talking about adding “things” it is asked, “Is it in your program review?” However when things are taken away, like LD assessment and class sections, there is no questioning about Program Review and a due process. It would be nice to have the same questions asked for both additions and subtractions in a department and some discussion to take place.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

C. Appeals

After the program review process is complete, your program has the right to appeal the ranking of initiatives (i.e. initiatives that should have been ranked high but were not, initiatives that were ranked high but should not have been), the division's decision to support/not support program discontinuance, or the process (either within the department/program or the division) itself.

If you choose to appeal, please complete the Appeals Form (Appendix D) 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.

VI – Submission Verification

Program/Department: EAC Program/ACT, EAC, LS classes

Preparer: Patty Wendt

Dates met (include email discussions): September 16,17,23,26, October 1,2,3, and 4th.

List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process:

Tom Dalton, Steve Turner, Patty Wendt- Lori Annala, John Elmer, Cathy Mundy

Preparer Verification: I verify that this program document was completed in accordance with the program review process.

Dean Verification: I verify that I have reviewed this program review document and find it complete. Dean may also provide comments (optional):



Program Review Process Map

I . Status report and accomplishments from prior year

II. Description

III(b). Other program goals and initiatives

(Innovations, regulations, legislation, new technology, industry standards, professional development, or advisory committee recommendations, etc.)

IV. Summary of initiatives and requests
Minority reports if any

VI. Process assessment

VII. Verification of review



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

WHAT TO LEAVE OUT

The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should NOT be included in the Program Review Document as initiatives.

<p>The table below summarizes the types of resources that DO NOT need to be included in the Department Plans. The "Who to Contact" column lists who to contact when the resources or services are needed.</p>		
Excluded Items	Who to Contact	Explanation
Safety Issues, including but not limited to broken chairs or desks, etc. that can be resolved through the normal process.	Dean, M&O or Appropriate Office	All safety issues should be immediately reported to the Dean, M&O, or appropriate department.
EAC Accommodations that can be resolved through the normal process.	DSPS and Dean	Any accommodation should have the guidance of the DSPS office.
Routine M&O maintenance & repair (light fixtures not working, holes in walls, locks, cleaning, broken desks or chairs, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process.	M&O or Division Office	Complete an email request to vcmaintenance@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Cyclical Maintenance (painting, flooring, carpet shampooed, windows, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process.	M&O or Division Office	Complete an email request to vcmaintenance@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Classroom technology equipment repairs (projector light bulb out, video screen not working, computer not working, existing software updates) that can be resolved through the normal process.	Campus Technology Center or Division Office	Complete an email request to vchelpdesk@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Section Offerings/ Change of classrooms	Dean/Department Chair	Dean will take requests through the enrollment management process.
Substitutes	Dean	Dean will process in accordance with existing guidelines.
Conferences, Meetings, Individual Training	Professional Development Committee	Requests should first be addressed by the PDC and only go through program review if costs cannot be covered.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

WHAT TO LEAVE IN

The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should be included in the Program Review Document as initiatives.

Faculty and Staff from each department will meet as a division to prioritize initiatives resulting from the Program Review process. The initiatives will then go to each respective governance groups such as Staffing Priorities, Technology Committee, Budget Resource Council, etc., for further prioritization. Administrative Council and the Executive Team will develop the final prioritized list and distribute for implementation.		
Included Items	Committee Group	Explanation
Replacement of classroom furniture	Facilities Oversight Group	Only when it is an entire classroom/lab/office at a time or a safety or disability issue that has not been resolve through the normal process.
Upgrade and/or replacement of computer and other technological equipment	Technology Committee	These items will go on to a list for replacement or upgrade per the technology plan.
New Equipment/Furniture/ classroom items (i.e. microscope, etc.)	Budget Resource Council	These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services.
Buildings/Office Space (new renovation, modernization)	Division Dean	The division dean will work with Administrative Council and the Fog Committee to pursue the projects.
New Software	Technology Committee	These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services.
New Faculty Positions	Faculty Staffing Priorities	Requests for new positions will compiled on a list and sent to the FSP committee.
New Classified Positions/or increase in percentage of existing positions.	Classified Staffing Priorities	Requests for classified positions will compiled on a list and sent to the CSP committee.
New Programs/certificates	Curriculum Committee	These program/certificates must be approved by the curriculum committee.
Training and Professional Development above normal	Professional Development/Budget Resource Council	These are items over and above what the PDC can provide.
Expansion/Conversion to Distance Learning	Dean of Distance Learning and Distance Learning Committee	Requests will be compiled and sent to the committee process for discussion.
Service Agreements	Budget Resource Council	Requests must include justification.
Instructional Materials and Office Supplies/ Advertising/Student Workers/Printing/Duplicating	Budget Resource Council/Dean	These items must include a compelling reason and be above what the normal budget will allow.



Educational Assistance Center Program Review 2013-2014

Appendix D

APPEAL FORM

(Due to Office of Institutional Effectiveness by November 8)

The program review appeals process is available to any faculty, staff, or administrator who feels strongly that the prioritization of initiatives (i.e. initiatives that were not ranked high but should have been, initiatives that were ranked high but should not have been), the decision to support or not support program discontinuance, or the process followed by the division should be reviewed by the College Planning Council.

Appeal submitted by: (name and program) _____

Date: _____

- Category for appeal:
- Faculty
 - Personnel – Other
 - Equipment- Computer
 - Equipment – Other
 - Facilities
 - Operating Budget
 - Program Discontinuance
 - Other (Please specify)

Briefly explain the process that was used to prioritize the initiative(s) being appealed:

Briefly explain the rationale for asking that the prioritization of an initiative/resource request be changed:

Appeals will be heard by the College Planning Council on November 9, 2011 at its regularly scheduled meeting (3:00 – 5:00 p.m.). You will be notified of your time to present.