Program Review Transmittal

General Information

Discipline/program/unit: Research and Planning

Academic Year: 2010-11

Report Abstract:

Evaluation results show that there continues to be a need for additional data, information as to how to access and interpret data, and a better understanding of the Integrated Planning Process (IPP). Recommendations for improvement are specified to address these needs.

Faculty/Stoff Representatives:	
Signature:	Date: 5/12/11
Signature:	Date:
Dean/Director: Signature: Chun MyUB	Date: 5/12/11
President, Academic Senate (for academic programs): Signature:	Date:
Exercise Vice President or Vice President: Signature:	Date:
Signature:	Date: 05/26/11

Program Name: Research and Planning Prepared by: Chris Myers, Interim Director Faculty/Staff Participating: Donna Vessels, Technician Date Completed: May 12, 2011

Program Review and Analysis

Part I Expected Outcomes

1. What are the (a) Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and (b) Academic Core Competencies ("Core Four") or Institutional Support Core Outcomes of the program? List each along with descriptions of the appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., assessment measures of outcomes), and criterion for success (how you know the outcomes have been achieved). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures, where appropriate.

	Assessment Measures			
	Outcome(s)	Qualitative Measure(s)	Quantitative Measure(s)	Criterion for Success
1	 Solano College employees will integrate appropriate data into program review reports (every four years) and three-year plans (annually). 		Compare the percentage of program reviews and three-year plans utilizing appropriate data during a one-year period with a baseline year.	Percentage of program reviews and three-year plans utilizing appropriate data will increase 10% above the baseline year.
2	 Solano College faculty, classified staff, and managers will understand and participate in the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) (annually). 		Employee ratings of applicable items on a survey administered every three years.	Seventy-five percent or more of respondents will agree that they understand and have participated in the IPP.
	 Solano College employees will be able to access and interpret needed data (as needed). 	Participants' comments about workshops addressing data access and interpretation.	b. Employee ratings of applicable items on a survey administered every three years.	a. Ninety percent or more of respondents will acknowledge that they have increased their understanding about data access and interpretation. b. Seventy-five percent or more of respondents will agree that they are able to access and interpret needed data.

Comment [rjs1]: NOTE: These comments have been inserted for your convenience. They need NOT affect the final format of this document and need NOT be removed. If you see the comment numbers and paragraph marks and do NOT wish to see them, simply click on the "Show" button on the "Reviewing" toolbar to toggle them off. The program analysis continues to focus on the quality and success of each college program. The following questions provide the framework for departmental program analysis.

Comment [cm2]: Benchmark or result indicating that success has been achieved.

2.	The specific SCC Strategic Goal(s) and Objective(s) supported by this program are (check all that apply):				
	Objective 1.2.	create an environment that is conducive to student learning. Create an environment that supports quality teaching. Optimize student performance on Institutional Core Competencies.			
	Goal 2: Maximize stude Objective 2.1 Objective 2.2 Objective 2.3 Objective 2.4 X Objective 2.5.	Update and strengthen career/technical curricula. Identify and provide appropriate support for transfer students. Improve student access to college facilities and services to students.			
	X Objective 3.1.	Respond to community needs. Expand ties to the community.			
		Develop and manage resources to support institutional effectiveness. Maximize organizational efficiency and effectiveness.			
Pa	rt II Analysis				
1.	1. List current data, disaggregated by student demographics (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age) and distance education status (i.e., face-to-face v. distance education). Identify and explain trends, as well as differences among demographic and distance education status subgroups, where appropriate.				
	A. Instructional Programs:				
	1. Enrollment—				
	2. Retention Rate—				
	3. Success Rate				

- 4. Fill rate—
- 5. Outcomes Assessment
 - a. Results—
 - b. How results have been used to improve the program—
- 6. Other Factors—
- B. Instructional Support Programs:
 - 1. Outcomes Assessment
 - a. Results—

Outcome 1. An analysis of Program Review reports completed in 2009-10 show that approximately 69% integrated appropriate data into the reports. This will serve as the baseline metric against which future assessments will be measured.

Outcome 2. An analysis of the 2010 Accreditation Employee Survey results show that the following percentages of survey respondents agreed with the specified statements:

Are familiar with the SCC Mission Statement – 95%

Are familiar with SCC Strategic Goals and Objectives – 88%

Have participated in developing Three-Year Plans for their unit – 75%

Are familiar with the Integrated Planning Process (IPP) – 69%

Understand how the IPP works: 66%

Three-Year Plans have been implemented in their unit – 62%

These results show that while most employees have a general understanding of the IPP and have participated in some parts of it, there is a continuing need to educate employees about the process and assure that it is implemented.

Outcome 3. An analysis of the 2010 Accreditation Employee Survey results shows that the following percentages of survey respondents agree with the specified statements:

Needed data are available for planning – 67%

Needed data are analyzed and interpreted for easy understanding – 65%

PAGE 3 OF 5

Comment [rjs3]: These are from the outcomes that have been previously identified in Part I.

Comment [rjs4]: These could include program completion rate, student success, etc.

Comment [rjs5]: These are from the outcomes that have been previously identified in Part I.

These results show that many respondents believe that there continues to be a need for additional data to be provided, analyzed, and interpreted for easy understanding.

b. How results have been used to improve the program—

Efforts have been made to provide better access to data. Specifically, a Strategic Proposal was developed requesting funds to develop a Data Mart and additional Banner reports to better support users' data needs. In addition, more specific guidelines were developed to assist employees in implementing the IPP.

2. Other Factors—

The Process Evaluation and Review Team (PERT) conducted an evaluation of the IPP and the PERT. Results showed that while most components of the IPP are working well, some improvements are needed, including condensing the Strategic/Operational proposal timeline and centralizing management of the proposals, reducing the number of and updating college-wide plans, and revising the Program Review and SLO/SAO processes so that they can be used by instructional and instructional support units. Some of these recommended changes have already been made and plans are in place to make some of the other changes.

2. How do the above trends relate to the factors and outcomes identified in the last program review?

Not applicable – this is the first Program Review for Research and Planning.

3. List the recommendations from the last program review and describe the degree to which they have been implemented.

Not applicable – this is the first Program Review for Research and Planning.

4. List available evaluation results of activities in the most current three year plan.

Research and Planning's first Three-Year Plan is currently under development.

Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

1. What are the major accomplishments of the program/unit since the last program review?

2009-10 Major Accomplishments: Revised IPP and provided staff training **Comment [cm6]:** The comments should be presented in list format and should correspond to the factors and outcomes as listed in Part I of the LAST program review.

Comment [rjs7]: This is the place to describe the program's successes, using either list or narrative format.

Established Process Evaluation and Review Team
Helped to facilitate revision of Mission Statement and Strategic Goals and Objectives
Supported Accreditation Follow-Up report
Facilitated use of CalPASS data by managers
Provided Discoverer training for users
Assisted with program evaluations

2010-11 Major Accomplishments:

Updated IPP, including Strategic/Operational Proposal process

Supported Accreditation Follow-Up Report and Self Study – conducted Accreditation Employee Survey and Student Opinion Survey; provided student characteristics and other data; helped to write Standard 1B narrative

Facilitated updating and reporting outcome results for Strategic Goals and Objectives

Provided training to managers and faculty about accessing data

Conducted college surveys: Budget, Smoking, Superintendent/President's Cabinet, Shared Governance Council, Financial and Budget Planning Advisory Council, Administrative Leadership Group, Online Faculty Evaluation

Facilitated updating Program Review process and accessing data via Banner

Updated Banner Data Standard Guide

Analyzed data for program evaluations

2. Based on the above analysis, specify recommendations for planned improvements to meet program goals or to enhance program effectiveness in the future.

Recommendations for improvement:

- 1. Facilitate development of a Data Mart and enhanced reporting of needed data and information.
- 2. Provide ongoing training related to accessing and interpreting needed data and information.
- 3. Automate planning and reporting processes.
- 4. Provide ongoing training and support for the Integrated Planning Process (IPP).
- 5. Establish a college-wide research agenda.