

### **Proposed 2024-2025 Program Review Process Improvements**

Each year, the College Planning Committee evaluates the program review process, and if necessary, makes adjustments to improve the process. Based on feedback received from across the campus, the following improvements are proposed for the 2024-2025 year:

1. Executive Team Planning Parameter Meeting – open meeting held in early September with the Executive Team to discuss the factors that they will consider when they are making final program review allocation decisions.
2. Campus-Wide Faculty Prioritization Meeting – a joint meeting in which various constituencies (i.e. faculty, deans, vice presidents) meet together to prioritize faculty requests.
3. Campus-Wide Classified Staff Prioritization Meeting – a joint meeting in which various constituencies (i.e. staff, deans, vice presidents) meet together to prioritize staff requests.
4. Comprehensive Program Review Presentations – rather than giving a presentation to the College Planning Committee, programs will present directly to the Executive Team.

#### **Executive Team Planning Parameter Meeting – September 4, 2024**

Prior to the opening of the 2024-2025 program review, the Executive Team will develop their annual planning parameters. These are the factors that the Executive Team will take into account as they are making final program review allocation decisions. The planning parameters will be sent to programs at the beginning of the program review process in late August, and will be posted on the program review webpage.

In early September, the Executive Team will hold an open meeting with the campus to discuss the planning parameters. The goal of this meeting is to ensure that the campus has a shared understanding of the planning parameters early in the program review process. Programs can then use this information as they are developing their resource requests.

#### **Campus-wide Faculty Prioritization Meeting – Nov 5, 2024**

Under the current program review process, faculty requests are ranked separately by the program, by their area (i.e. Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business and Administrative Services), and by the Academic Senate prior to going to the Executive Team. The purpose of this process is to ensure that the Executive Team has feedback from across the campus as they are making their final allocation decisions.

However, there have been a number of issues with this process. First, each group has a different method and/or rubric for ranking requests. This has led to situations in which a request is ranked very high by one group, but very low by another group. Further, this process takes months to complete, as committees and workgroups review and rank requests. It also takes up a substantial amount of committee meeting time.

To alleviate these issues, one proposed option is to have a campus-wide prioritization meeting, in which various constituencies meet together to review and score requests using a common rubric. The scores would then be averaged together, and sent to the College President and Executive Team, who would make the final allocation decisions.

#### *Meeting Representatives*

This meeting would include representatives from the following constituencies:

- Academic Senate - one faculty representative per department (approx. 20-30 faculty)
- Deans - all Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Deans and Assistant Deans (9)
- Vice Presidents – all Vice Presidents (non-voting)
- Academic Senate President – non-voting co-chair
- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness – non-voting co-chair

Meeting attendees would be provided with all faculty requests and relevant program data at least a week in advance of the meeting. Representatives will be expected to have reviewed this information prior to the meeting.

#### *Meeting Format*

The meeting will be approximately 3-4 hours long, and will be held in an in-person format. Programs requesting a faculty position will have the opportunity to provide a 3-minute presentation to the group. Programs requesting multiple positions will be given a maximum of 5 minutes to discuss all of their requests. Presentations can either be given in person, or via a pre-recorded video. There will then be a maximum of two minutes for questions.

Voting representatives will then complete an electronic scoring sheet for each request (see faculty prioritization rubric on page 5). Representatives must rank all requests for their scores to be counted. Scoring sheets will be completed before the end of the meeting. Average scores will then be calculated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and will be distributed to the meeting attendees, as well as to the College President and Executive Team.

The College President and Executive Team will then make the final allocation decisions, and will communicate them to the campus.

All full-time faculty requests made through the program review process will be provided to the voting representatives. However, representatives will only rank requests that do not have dedicated categorical funds available. When entering the request into the program review system, programs will indicate if they have categorical funds available for the request, and if so, they will be required to enter a FOAP. Requests that have been submitted with a valid categorical FOAP will be provided as informational items, and will be sent directly to the College President and Executive Team for final allocation decisions.

#### **Campus-wide Classified Staff Prioritization Meeting – Nov 8, 2024**

Under the current program review process, staff requests are ranked separately by the program, by their area (i.e. Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business and Administrative Services), and by the Classified Senate prior to going to the Executive Team. The purpose of this process is to ensure that the Executive Team has feedback from across the campus as they are making their final allocation decisions.

However, there have been a number of issues with this process. First, each group has a different method and/or rubric for ranking requests. This has led to situations in which a request is ranked very high by one group, but very low by another group. Further, this process takes months to complete, as committees and workgroups review and rank requests. It also takes up a substantial amount of committee meeting time.

To alleviate these issues, one proposed option is to have a campus-wide prioritization meeting, in which various constituencies meet together to review and score requests using a common rubric. The scores would then be averaged together, and sent to the College President and Executive Team, who would make the final allocation decisions.

#### *Meeting Representatives*

This meeting would include representatives from the following constituencies.

- Classified Senate - one classified representative per department (approx. 20-30 classified staff)
- Deans - all Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Deans and Assistant Deans (9)
- Vice Presidents – all Vice Presidents (non-voting)
- Classified Senate President – non-voting co-chair
- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness – non-voting co-chair

Meeting attendees would be provided with all classified staff requests and relevant program data at least a week in advance of the meeting. Representatives will be expected to have reviewed this information prior to the meeting.

#### *Meeting Format*

The meeting will be approximately 3-4 hours long, and will be held in an in-person format. Programs requesting a staff position will have the opportunity to provide a 3-minute presentation to the group. Programs requesting multiple positions will be given a maximum of 5 minutes to discuss all of their requests. Presentations can either be given in person, or via a pre-recorded video. There will then be a maximum of two minutes for questions.

Voting representatives will then complete an electronic scoring sheet for each request (see Classified Staff Prioritization Rubric on page 7). Representatives must rank all requests for their scores to be counted. Scoring sheets will be completed before the end of the meeting. Average scores will then be calculated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and will be distributed to the meeting attendees, as well as to the College President and Executive Team.

The College President and Executive Team will then make the final allocation decisions, and will communicate them to the campus.

All classified staff requests made through the program review process will be provided to the voting representatives. However, representatives will only rank requests that do not have dedicated categorical funds available. When entering the request into the program review system, programs will indicate if they have categorical funds available for the request, and if so, they will be required to enter a FOAP. Requests that have been submitted with a valid categorical FOAP will be provided as informational items, and will be sent directly to the College President and Executive Team for final allocation decisions.

#### **Comprehensive Program Review Feedback and Presentations**

In the 2021-2022 College Planning Committee (CPC) evaluation of the program review process, programs noted that they put a lot of work into their program review, but there was very little acknowledgment or feedback received from outside of their program. Thus, the process was updated to allow programs to receive feedback from both the College Planning Committee and the Executive Team. Specifically, the College Planning Committee reviewed programs that were undergoing a comprehensive review. Programs had the option to provide an in-person or pre-recorded presentation to CPC. Then, CPC members submitted feedback that went to both the program and the Executive Team. The Executive Team then reviewed the program review, as well as the CPC feedback to develop a set of commendations and recommendations for each program.

This process has been in place for the past two years. However, in the most recent CPC committee evaluation, CPC members noted that the presentations and subsequent feedback provided weren't the most productive use of committee time. Further, there were questions about how substantive the CPC feedback was in relation to program improvement.

Thus, one potential change to the process would be to remove CPC from the feedback process entirely. Rather, programs would discuss their program strengths, opportunities, etc., directly with the Executive Team. In some preliminary discussions with the Executive Team, this could take the following format:

- The Executive Team would review the program's comprehensive review and data in advance of the meeting.

- The program would meet with the Executive Team and have a conversation about their program's goals and plans.
- The Executive Team would then develop a set of commendations and recommendations, which would be incorporated into subsequent year program reviews.

This process would thus allow department chairs and coordinators to discuss their program with the Executive Team directly. It would also allow CPC to use its meeting time more productively.

DRAFT

## Faculty Prioritization Rubric

The faculty prioritization rubric was developed by Rachel Johnson (Academic Senate President), James Walker (2023-24 Academic Senate Faculty Staffing Priorities Workgroup Leader), and Phillip Briggs (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness). It borrows heavily from Moorpark College's faculty prioritization rubric, and is aligned with the VC classified staff prioritization rubric. It has been developed in a manner to be applied to both instructional and non-instructional faculty requests. It includes two types of criteria:

1. Quantitative criteria – based on key data metrics. Data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
2. Qualitative criteria – based on key considerations that are not easily measured by data metrics. Assessed by voting representatives at campus-wide faculty prioritization meeting.

### Instructional Faculty Prioritization Rubric

Quantitative Criteria	1 (Low)	3 (Medium)	5 (High)
Percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty	More than 60%	30-60%	Less than 30%
Course fill rate	Lower 3rd of college	Middle 3rd of college	Upper 3rd of college
Qualitative Criteria	1 (Low)	3 (Medium)	5 (High)
Discipline/Program need			
Campus and/or community impact			
Unique considerations			

### Non-Instructional Faculty Prioritization Rubric

Quantitative Criteria	1 (Low)	3 (Medium)	5 (High)
Percentage of services provided by full-time faculty	More than 60%	30-60%	Less than 30%
Student contacts per FTEF	Lower 3rd of college	Middle 3rd of college	Upper 3rd of college
Qualitative Criteria	1 (Low)	3 (Medium)	5 (High)
Discipline/Program need			
Campus and/or community impact			
Unique considerations			

Qualitative Criteria Detail:

- Discipline/Program Need – how critical is this request to the program’s ability to function? Please consider current staffing levels, as well as the current and future workload.
- Campus and/or Community Impact – how large of an impact would this position have on the campus, as a whole? What impact would this position have on the surrounding community?
- Unique Considerations – are there considerations unique to this position (i.e. legislative requirements, accreditation requirements, etc.)?

DRAFT

**Classified Staff Prioritization Rubric**

The classified staff prioritization rubric was developed by Phillip Briggs (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness) and Michael Haydon. It borrows heavily from Moorpark College's prioritization rubric, and is also aligned with the VC faculty prioritization rubric.

**Classified Staff Prioritization Rubric**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>1 (Low)</b>	<b>3 (Medium)</b>	<b>5 (High)</b>
Discipline/Program need			
Campus and/or community impact			
Unique considerations			

**Classified Staff Criteria Detail:**

- Discipline/Program Need – how critical is this request to the program's ability to function? For this metric, consider current staffing levels, as well as the current and future workload.
- Campus and/or Community Impact – how large of an impact would this position have on the campus, as a whole? What impact would this position have on the surrounding community?
- Unique Considerations – are there considerations unique to this position (i.e. legislative requirements, accreditation requirements, etc.)?