Draft due March 5, 2012. Please email your draft to mnarvaez@lbcc.edu.

Program Review provides an opportunity for the department to

- Explore holistically its effectiveness
- Evaluate whether its services are effective based on evidence documented by outcomes assessment
- Ensure consistency between department goals and institutional goals
- Share its successes

Expected Outcomes of the Review:

- An evidence-based evaluation of the department's effectiveness in terms of the goals established
- Leads to realistic plans for improving the area
- The development and more effective use of Service Unit Outcomes (SUOs) to support institutional planning, decision making, and effectiveness
- Greater clarity about the department’s goals and criteria for defining and evaluating those goals
- Improvement of the department’s capacity for self-review and quality assurance
- Enhanced focus on the department’s input in improving programs and services, especially those that support student learning
- A deeper understanding of effective coordination and resource use for improved institutional performance

For those departments that have functional areas that have a wide variety of primary functions, you may want each functional area to conduct their own mini-review. However, there should only be one program review submitted per department, as listed below.

Student Support Services

- Admissions and Records
- Counseling/Student Support Development
- Financial Aid, EOPS, Veterans Affairs
- Student Affairs, Physical Education and Athletics

Administrative Units

- Academic Services
- Business Support Services
- Community Relations and Marketing
- Economic Development
- Facilities
- Fiscal
- Human Resources - Academic
- Human Resources – Classified
- Human Resources – Professional Development
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Instructional and Information Technology Services
- Institutional Resource Development
- Workforce Development
Part 1: Review of Past 3 Years

For Part 1, please limit your responses to one page for each numbered question (1 - 4).

1. Service Unit Outcomes Assessment Results

   A. Summarize Service Unit Outcomes assessment results. Highlight notable successes and areas requiring improvement. Discuss what actions were taken based on the assessment results and any improvements (i.e., process, service delivery, communication, etc.) that can be observed.

   The Institutional Resource Development Department had two goals identified for assessment. The first was to design an effective grant development process and the second was to align grant activities with institutional goals and priorities. Substantial progress was made on both goals and assessment methods included checklists and an inventory of new documentation created. Notable successes include the development of a new grant development process. These goals remain active as the new process is vetted throughout the campus community and modified based on input and feedback.

   B. If applicable, identify the data regularly collected and/or reported as part of program compliance, fulfillment of demand, efficiency or effectiveness.

      Initial data was just the inventory of the documents created. The next step in assessing this goal will be the effectiveness of the forms and the feedback from users.

2. Situational Analysis (as it relates to progress in achieving department goals)

   A. External Conditions – Looking back at the previously identified external conditions that have impacted the department, describe the ones that have affected the department most significantly and what actions the department took to respond to those conditions.

      The most significant external factors were the statewide budget cuts. With each round of budget cuts the IRD division is hit with increased requests to backfill cuts and programs and to search for additional grant dollars. This was most significant around the 2008-09 Fiscal Year. It required substantial time and effort to educate the college community on the purpose of grant funding, the overall grant requirement that prohibits supplanting and the impact on the institution each grant brings. Too often individuals were focused on just bringing in additional money and were not focused on the larger impact. Including the fact that grant funds are a temporary fix and do not address sustainability issues beyond the life of the grant. The IRD department responded to this by reevaluating the grant procurement process and working directly with the administrators to orient them to the criteria and standards they should be evaluating grant requests. The department transferred the evaluation and decision-making authority to where it belongs, with the departments and their administrators. Additionally, new criteria and procedures were developed in partnership with the Grants Advisory Committee.

   B. Internal Conditions - Looking back at the previously identified internal conditions that have impacted the department, describe the ones that have affected the department most significantly and what actions the department took to respond to those conditions.

      The internal factor that had the most impact on IRD was the development and implementation of the new planning process and the accreditation recommendation that highlighted the need to align funding with program planning. The IRD department worked with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to align the newly developed process for grant development with program planning. Most notable was the redesigning of the VTEA allocation process to program planning.
A second major factor to the office was the loss of staff member due to budget cuts and the acquisition of additional areas of responsibility due to retirements. The office has been over capacity for a substantial period of time and the level and quality of output has been impacted.

C. Collaboration - What are the department’s strengths and weaknesses in the area of collaboration (internal and external)? Describe the key collaborative relationships that your department is involved in and explain how these partnerships strengthen its capacity to advance student success/enhance the quality of services and programs provided/ create greater operational efficiencies for the department.

The IRD department has a substantial focus on collaboration, both internal and external, and much of the day to day work centers on these partnerships. Most notably the department works with multiple areas of the college on new grant development and awarded grant implementation. Additionally, through the CTE/workforce development project management aspect the department is actively engaged with local employer partners, social service agencies and community organizations. The areas strengths is the long standing relationships throughout the community and the partnerships established over time. The weaknesses are the department’s capacity to nurture these relationships and commit to engaging in meaningful ways. The partnerships are critical to effectively engaging key stakeholders in the college’s student success agenda and in the securing of external resources for the college and students.

D. Communication - How effectively does information flow from this department to other departments on campus? How does your department make data and information available to faculty/staff/students, and/or prospective students?

This is an area that continues to need work for the IRD department. The flow of communication was substantially hindered by the overload in capacity and the focus on developing new information. A key step in moving towards improved communication was the redesign of the department’s website which includes the workforce development programs, the CTE specially funded programs, contract and community education program, and institutional grant development. This needs to be a continued area of focus for the department and we recognize that more work needs to be done to support improved communication with the college community.

3. Primary Functions/ Primary Purpose/ Department Mission

A. Note any changes in your department’s primary functions since the beginning of the cycle (2009-2010). Describe any changes that might warrant a modification of your department’s mission statement.

The mission state is still relevant for the department even as it has evolved.

B. In the past three years, have the functions or services of your department changed in how you directly or indirectly support student learning? If so, please describe.

Changes have not changed how we support the college and/or student learning. The scope of the area has increased but additional are in alignment with original functions.

4. Goal Progress

A. Describe your department’s progress in achieving its goals, highlighting achievements or areas needing continued focus and the evidence to support these claims. Where appropriate, indicate any factors that impacted progress toward achieving a goal.

The department has made continued progress on achieving the stated goals. A major impact to the speed of progress has just been the lack of staffing and the addition of new areas of responsibility. The next stage would be to increase the communication of the new processes and procedures and to identify next steps in formalizing the grant development process.
B. Describe the adequacy of resources to achieve goals (resources include Personnel, Facilities, Technology, Fiscal).

Current resources are adequate for slow and steady progress considering that additional resources are scarce. The area has also taken measures to evaluate what activities can be reduced or minimized as we focus on higher priority items.

C. Describe the impact of any resource allocations you have received over the past 3 years in terms of the effectiveness of your department.

The area has not had any new District resource allocations over the past 3 years. Each new grant awarded has not allowed for additional staff and has contributed to the existing workload.


Please limit your response for Part 2 to one page.

1. Vision and Direction of Department/Area

A. As a result of your evaluation and the changes you may anticipate, in what direction do you envision taking your department for the next three years?

I envision continuing our foundation building and alignment with the college’s priorities (student success agenda, promise pathways, workforce & economic development). The area will also be focused on defining key roles and outcomes for the area so that workload is aligned, effective and intentionally supporting college priorities. Lastly, the area will be focused on improving communication and informing key stakeholders and the support and resources the area is able to provide to the college community.

B. Are there ways your department can better support the higher level goals of the Educational Master Plan, Superintendent-President, Board of Trustees, your VP's goals? (See http://www.lbcc.edu/Planning/CollegewidePlans.cfm )

Our department is working to better support the college goals by establishing measurable objectives and outcomes that support the institutional priorities.

C. Are there any anticipated conditions or trends that might impact the department? How can the department prepare for these upcoming changes? What are some opportunities anticipated for the next three years that departments want to seize?

Potential budget cuts will continue to impact the department in many, many ways. The department is preparing for this through the increase in communication, the focusing of activities and in attempting to increase and diversify external funding streams.

D. What changes in the area of collaboration are needed to make this department more effective in its mission?

Regular outreach and engagement with the college community would enhance the department’s ability to make progress on goals and increase revenue streams.

E. Identify any areas where challenges in communication could be improved.

It is the areas perspective that challenges in communication are primarily due to the lack of intentional focus on communication, including not having a department website. Intentional efforts will be focused on addressing these challenges.
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F. Describe the feasibility of making the vision you have outlined a reality. How much can be achieved in the next three years? What are the resources or support (technology, office space, staffing, professional development, etc.) needed? What challenges do you anticipate?

The vision outlined has been intentionally limited and extremely focused based on the experience of the past three years. The full spectrum of activities and goals proved unrealistic and overwhelming and while significant progress was made, it was made at a cost to the staff and the quality of outputs. It is the area’s intention to move forward with a very defined and limited focus so that the output is effective, complete and achievable within the timeframe. It is anticipated that the area will meet all of the outlined vision within the timeframe. At this time no additional resources are needed but this may change as progress is made and new strategies are identified.

**Part 3: Evidence of Staff Participation in Program Review**

Please limit your response for Part 3 to one page.

1. Please describe how the department staff participated in the program review process (i.e., staff meetings, online collaboration such as Google Docs, department retreat, etc.). Please include specific dates for meetings held or activities conducted.

   While the department has not met consistently with the sole focus on program planning the area does meet weekly on Tuesday mornings to discuss all aspects of the area including external factors, college-wide updates, department priorities and department vision. These meetings will continue with additional program planning specific meetings scheduled.

2. Please list names and titles of all those who participated in this program review.
   Marty Alvarado, Director
   Michelle Whitfield, Program Manager
   Jeannie Bork, Program Manager
   Amy Smith, CTE Coordinator
   Carina Serrano, CTPD Coordinator
   Ellen Campbell, Grant Assistant
   Ashley Spindler, Grant Assistant

**Additional Comments (optional; limit to one page)**