LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE
PROGRAM PLAN/ PROGRAM REVIEW
Table of Contents

PROGRAM PLAN/ PROGRAM REVIEW
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Program Plan/Program Review Implementation Team was formed in the Spring Semester of 2009 by the College Planning Committee. The Team worked over a period of approximately eleven weeks to develop a revised program planning and review process for Long Beach City College.

Team Membership:

- Eva Bagg, Associate Dean, Institutional Effectiveness (Co-Chair)
- David Morse, Academic Senate Past President (Co-Chair)
- Mae Sakamoto , Director of Applications Development and Support
- Wil Shaw, Chair, Program Review Committee
- Patricia Alexander, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator
- Patricia Davis, Deputy Director, Finance and Accounting
- Marty Alvarado, Interim Director of Grants
- Tom To, Interim Dean, Counseling and Student Support Services
- Maria Narvaez, Planning Analyst, Institutional Effectiveness
- John Downey, Faculty Professional Development Coordinator
- Jeff Wheeler, English Department Head
- Joan Zuckerman, Life Science Department Head
- Cathy Crane, Curriculum Committee Chair
- John Fylpaa, Dean of Physical Education and Athletics

Team Charge:

- Implement recommendations from the Program Planning/Program Review Task Force as they are approved by the College Planning Committee.
- Collaborate with all constituent groups to develop a program planning and review process that:
  - accommodates the needs of each area and provides flexibility so that the needs of all programs and departments in the college, including the Superintendent-President's Office, Academic Affairs, Student Support Services, Human Resources, Economic & Resource Development and Administrative Services, etc. are met.

- develops a set of standardized prompts for use across the institution and necessary prompts designed to capture any planning and review needs specific to individual units
- provides different types of reports to be extracted from the program planning/program review tool to inform and support decision-reaching (i.e. hiring priorities, budget requests, SLO assessment, examples of department/division goals that link to college goals)
- provides transparency throughout the process, including appropriate open access to finalized unit plans throughout the college
- clearly maps out the flow of information (i.e., input, decision-reaching, approvals, feedback)
- Develop a calendar to assure that program planning and review deadlines align with college hiring, budgeting and accreditation cycles
- Develop and monitor the progress of software development in accordance with the recommended timeline for implementation.
- Develop documentation and training materials for users of the new program planning and review process and tool. Collaborate with Faculty Professional Development and Staff Professional Development to develop and provide training to all users.
- Provide status reports and recommendations to the CPC.
- Recommend workplan to CPC by March 15, 2009.

Because the Team was not actually formed until the first week of March, the March 15 deadline indicated within the charge was deemed unreasonable and impossible to meet.

Process:
- The Team held its first meeting on Friday, March 13. In this two hour meeting, the following workgroups were developed to address specific aspects of the Team's charge:
  - Instructional Unit Prompts: Wil Shaw, Jeff Wheeler, Joan Zuckerman, and Patricia Alexander
  - Student Support Services Prompts: Tom To (to work in consultation with other individuals in the Student Support Services area).
  - Administrative Unit Prompts: Marty Alvarado, Patricia Davis
  - Dean Level/Inter- level Prompts: John Fylpaa, Cathy Crane
  - Report Output: Mae Sakamoto, John Downey, Maria Narvaez

- - Process and Information Flow: Eva Bag and David Morse
- On Friday, March 27, the Team held a second two-hour meeting at which the workgroups reported on their progress and received input from other Team members.

- On Friday, April 3, the Team held a day-long meeting from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. At this meeting the Team discussed the products developed by the workgroups and drew together those individual products into an overall draft proposal for a revised planning and review process.

- On Thursday, April 9 and Tuesday, April 14, the Team co-chairs held open forums at which they presented the draft proposal to the college community. Both forums were attended by faculty, administrators, and classified staff. Attendees of the forums provided input on the draft proposal both at the forums and through e-mail communications throughout the following week.

- Following the April 14 forum, the draft proposal documents were posted on the college planning web site. All members of the campus community were invited through an e-mail to read the documents and send input regarding the proposed process.

- Also on Tuesday, April 14, the Team co-chairs and other team members met with a representative of the TracDat software company. The representative reviewed the proposed process and answered questions regarding TracDat's ability to support the proposal. This conversation with the TracDat company has continued through e-mail and telephone conversations and remains ongoing.

- On Monday, April 20, the Team met to consider input received from the college community after the open forums and to integrate that input into the proposal.

- On Thursday, April 23, the Team presented a preliminary draft of the revised process proposal to the College Planning Committee. The CPC approved the overview of the process in principle and, following a recommendation by the Implementation Team, approved the purchase of the TracDat software.

- The Team continued to work and revise documents by e-mail for the following three weeks. During this time period, the Team co-chairs met with the Superintendent/President, the Associate Vice-President of the Pacific Coast Campus, the Deputy Director of Finance and Accounting, and all of the college's vice-presidents to discuss the draft proposal and receive input on aspects of the process specifically relevant to those individuals. The co-chairs then communicated that input to the Team through their suggested revisions of the draft documents.

- On Monday, May 18, the Team met again to finalize its recommendations and its proposal for a revised planning and review process. The Team considered all of the documents developed previously and reached agreement on all aspects of the process that had been completed to that point.

- On Thursday, May 21, the Team presented its proposed revision of the program planning and review process to the College Planning Committee.

Team Recommendations:

The Team's recommendations for a revised program planning and review process are contained in the pages that follow this introduction. The proposal includes the following documents:

- A process and information flow chart

- A narrative describing the process in more detail.

- A process timeline

- A prioritization criteria to guide decision-making throughout the process

- Prompts to guide the content of the instructional, student support services, and administrative unit program reviews at the department or program level.

- Prompts to guide the content of the school or dean level reviews and plans and other inter-level reviews and plans.

- Prompts for the vice-president level reviews and plans.

- A proposed charge for the inter-level task forces and a proposed composition for the instructional dean level task forces.

- A proposed charge for the vice-president level task forces.

- A validation response form for use by the Program Review Sub-Committee and Validation Teams in responding to the department or program level reviews and plans. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will be responsible for coordinating the Validation Teams.

- An evaluation process through which the planning and review process may be reviewed, analyzed, and revised as necessary on a yearly basis.

In addition, the Team recommends the creation of a new Implementation Task Force to oversee the implementation of this process in its first year (2009-2010). A proposed charge and composition for this task force is included as a part of the process

proposal. This task force should be created immediately in order that it may prepare for the implementation of the process in Fall 2009.

<u>Next Steps</u>:

The following aspects of the process have not been completed and should be addressed by the appropriate college personnel or by the new Implementation Task Force:

1. Development of training and staff development activities and materials necessary for the implementation of the planning and review process.

2. Development and implementation of the TracDat software system.

3. Determination of the exact composition of vice-president level task forces and non-instructional inter-level task forces.

Program Plan/ Program Review (PPPR)
Information Flow

Departments conduct
Program Reviews and develop Plans

PPPRs

Feedback loop to
departments
happen in Steps 2-4

Instructional PPPRs go to Program Review Subcommittee;
Non-Instructional PPPRs go to Validation Teams

Curriculum Committee -
Receives evaluations for
Instructional PPPRs only;
Can forward recommendations
to VP Acad Affairs work group

Inter-Level (School or
Area) Work Groups
prioritize requests

forwards consolidated plans
from each school/ area to
appropriate VP

VP Level
Work Groups

Each group
compiles plans
into single
document

CPC

Task Forces created
as needed

Develops
institutional
priorities

Collegewide
Communication re
Priorities,
Accomplishments, etc.

BAC, S-P, BOT

Step 1:
Depts &
Areas
write
PPPR

Important Dates:
7/30/09 – Training @
DH Academy
8/14/09 – Start
process at College
Day

Step 2:
PPPR
Validation
(2-4 wks)

Important Dates:
10/1/09 – PPPR
DUE – submit to PR
Subcommittee or
Validation Teams

Step 3:
Inter-Level
Work
Groups
(2-4 wks)

Important Dates:
11/2/09 – Validated
PPPR DUE – submit
to Inter-Level Work
Groups

Decisions re Cap Outlay,
VTEA funding are made
during Steps 3 & 4

Step 4:
VP Level
Work
Groups
(2-4 wks)

Important Dates:
12/1/09 –
Consolidated PPPR
DUE – submit to VP
Level Work Groups

Step 5:
CPC

Important Dates:
1/31/10 – PPPR due
to CPC
CPC develops
institutional priorities

Step 6:
BAC,
S-P, BOT
& College

Important Dates:
3/15/10 – CPC
sends priorities to
BAC & S-P; CPC
sends collegewide
communication re
priorities,
accomplishments,
etc.

PROPOSED PROGRAM REVIEW/PROGRAM PLANNING
INFORMATION FLOW

Process for year one (2009-2010):

(All departments and programs will participate in the planning and review process in year one.)

Step 1: **Department and program level plans and reviews developed.**

> These plans and reviews should include information on accomplishments, resource requests for budgeting, SLO assessment data, and plans and projects for expansion or improvement as appropriate. Cap outlay and VTEA requests may be included for both the current year and for 2010-2011. If program plans and reviews contain details that require cooperation with other college areas such as instructional technology or the grants office, those plans and reviews will be forwarded by the department head or designee to the appropriate office for consideration of feasibility and potential inclusion in the planning of those areas. Any plans or projects involving the PCC campus should also be forwarded by the department head or designee to the office of the Associate Vice-President of the PCC Campus for use in planning process and goal development of that office.

Step 2: Program reviews and plans are forwarded to the Program Review Sub-Committee of the Curriculum Committee or to Administrative Program Review Validation Teams as appropriate. Instructional program reviews are also forwarded to inter-level planning groups for use in step 3. The Program Review Sub-committee and validation teams evaluate, comment on, and verify completion of the program reviews and plans per their charges.   The sub-committee and validation teams then complete an evaluative response for each program review. In addition to serving as a technical review to ensure that each program review and plan is completed, the response may offer recommendations and guidance as appropriate to provide input on or reactions to specific projects and to help programs and departments develop stronger reviews and plans in the future. These response documents are sent back to the department and programs from which the reviews originated.

Step 3: Instructional program and department level reviews and plans are forwarded from the program review sub-committee to inter-level planning groups. Non-instructional program reviews and plans are forwarded from the validation teams to the appropriate VP level planning group. Reports from the Program Review Sub-Committee and validation teams will include the response documents developed in step 2 in order to reflect the comments and recommendations of the sub-committee and validation teams. While the completion of the work of the inter-level groups must wait until this input from to the Program Review Sub-committee arrives, the groups may begin addressing their task while the sub-committee is developing its responses. Individual departments and programs are also invited to send additional input to the inter-level groups if they disagree with the response documents from the sub-committee and the validation teams.

A. Short-term planning groups will be established at the school level for instructional plans and reviews. These inter-level groups are led by the dean responsible for the area and will include faculty representatives from all departments within the area. The groups may also include staff representatives as appropriate. The groups will compile the reviews and plans developed by departments and programs in their respective areas into the inter-level review and planning documents, communicating accomplishments, SLO data, goals and projects for expansion or improvement as appropriate, and resource needs. Inter-level groups will discuss and prioritize projects and resource requests based on department and program plans and reviews, response forms from the Program Review Sub-Committee or Validation Teams, and feasibility reports from appropriate areas of the college such as instructional technology or the grants office. The groups will prioritize cap outlay and VTEA requests for both the current year and for 2010-2011.

Department representatives on these groups report back to their constituencies on the work and decisions of the group and are expected to represent the concerns of those constituencies in group discussions. Whenever specific projects or plans from a department or program are determined by the task force not be major priorities for the current year or are not forwarded as a part of the inter-level document, an explanation for this decision will be sent to the department or program in question via the appropriate representatives on the task force.

B. The CPC will establish a similar planning group for the PCC Campus. This group will be co-chaired by the Associate Vice-President of the PCC Campus and should receive input from departments and programs regarding any projects or plans that involve the PCC Campus. This group will develop an administrative planning and review report that will be forwarded to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs at the same time as the reports from instructional deans. Relevant sections of the PCC planning and review document may also be forwarded to other vice-president level planning groups as appropriate.

Step 4: Inter-level plans and reviews forwarded to VP level planning groups.

The CPC will create five short-term planning groups for the academic affairs, student support services, administrative services, economic and resource development, and human resources areas. The groups will be chaired by the appropriate vice-president of each area and will consist of appropriate faculty, administrative, and staff representation. Each VP level group will compile and organize the inter-level plans and reviews for its area into a single document, designating and highlighting accomplishments, compiling SLO data, listing and prioritizing projects necessary for improvements in specific areas, and identifying and prioritizing college-wide initiatives to be pursued in the coming year . The groups will compile cap outlay and VTEA requests for both the current year and for 2010-2011 and forward those requests to the appropriate work group for funding determination. All group members are expected to report back to the members of the inter-level groups and to keep their areas informed regarding the decisions and discussions of the VP level groups. Representatives from departments, programs, and the inter-level groups are invited to send additional input to the appropriate VP level group as necessary or desired. The Curriculum Committee will also be invited to send input to the Instructional VP group regarding curricular planning issues.

Steps 5: Plans and reviews from VP level forwarded to CPC.

CPC considers plans, reviews, and recommendations from VP level task forces to highlight major accomplishments from the past year and determine budget priorities and college-wide initiatives for the coming year. Before reaching any final decisions on priorities, projects, or goals, CPC will communicate its draft conclusions to the college through deans, department heads, and other

appropriate mechanisms. College constituencies are invited to send additional input to the CPC as necessary or desired.

Step 6: Information compiled by CPC from the VP level plans and reviews is disseminated and used in four ways:

A. CPC determines budget priority recommendations and forwards them to the Budget Advisory Committee. These priorities will apply to the following academic year.

B. CPC forwards list of accomplishments from the past year, including SLO data, and a list of planned projects and initiatives for the future to the Superintendent/President, who then communicates the information to the Board of Trustees.

C. CPC forms task forces as necessary to address and advance college-wide issues and initiatives that arise from the planning and review process. These task forces may be established to begin work immediately or for the following academic year as CPC deems appropriate.

D. The CPC disseminates in writing to the college community its decisions on prioritization, its list of accomplishments, its recommendations to the Superintendent/President, and its plans for task forces to be created.

Step 7: The Superintendent/President, after presentation and discussion with the Board of Trustees of the accomplishments and of the planned projects and initiatives developed through the planning and review process, will provide a written acceptance and general response to the CPC. This feedback is then communicated to the college community for use in ongoing planning decisions for the current year and to inform planning decisions for the following year.

Step 8: In spring, task forces created in steps 3 and 4 re-convene to receive progress updates on initiatives and goals included in the plans and reviews they developed, give feedback on the process and on current issues, and discuss issues and needs that have arisen since the development on the plans and reviews. Observations from these task forces are moved forward to CPC through a process parallel to that used for developing the original plans and reviews.

- At this time, inter-level groups will consider the base budget for the area and the resource and budget requests developed and prioritized during the fall in order to reach budget decisions for 2010-2011 and develop budget augmentation requests or budget reduction recommendations as needed.

- Also at this time, the PCC planning group will develop preliminary or suggested goals and plans for 2010-2011 and forward those plans as appropriate as suggestions to departments and programs throughout the college in order that the departments and programs can consider these suggestions as a part of their planning process in Fall 2010.

Process for year two (2010-2011):

(All departments and programs will participate in the planning and review process in year two.)

The planning and review process for year two will follow the same steps as year one with the following exceptions:

1. Departments will be asked to consider faculty and classified hiring requests during the Spring 2010 semester for 2011-2012. Departments will then confirm these requests at the beginning of the fall semester and submit the appropriate paperwork to support the requests per the faculty hiring process. Information necessary to support these requests will be submitted on separate forms as per previous practice but will be parallel to the information used in the program planning and review process.

2. Capital Outlay and VTEA requests for the 2011-2012 year will be submitted by departments and prioritized through the Fall 2010 planning process. Inter-level groups will prioritize these requests for their areas and forward them these priorities to the appropriate Vice-president level groups, who will compile the requests and forward them to the appropriate work group for funding determination.

Process for year three (2011-2012) and beyond:

The planning and review process for year three will follow the same steps as year one with the following exceptions:

1. All departments and programs will participate in the planning process. Beginning in year three, departments and programs will begin completing the review aspect of the process on a three-year comprehensive cycle with specific sections updated annually. Participation in this process will be staggered, with one-third of all departments participating in any given year. However, to facilitate planning at the school level or among other closely associated units, all departments or programs within a given area or school will be placed on a common cycle.

2. Departments will be asked to consider faculty and classified hiring requests during the spring semester of each year. Departments will then confirm these requests at the beginning of the following fall semester and submit the appropriate paperwork to support the requests per the faculty hiring process. Information necessary to support these requests will be submitted on separate forms as per previous practice but will be parallel to the information used in the program planning and review process.

3. Capital Outlay and VTEA requests will be submitted by departments and prioritized through the fall planning process one year in advance of final approval. Inter-level groups will prioritize these requests for their areas and forward them these priorities to the appropriate Vice-president level groups, who will compile the requests and forward them to the appropriate work group for funding determination. Preliminary priorities for Cap Outlay and VTEA will thus be established one year in advance. The appropriate work group will then act on these priorities and forward the finalized list of approved requests to the College Executive Committee when the exact amount of funding is determined each year.

Program Plan/ Program Review Timeline 2009-2010

	PPPR Paper Process			TracDat	
Step #	Date	Activity	Date	Activity	
	Spring – Summer 2009	Develop training materials Train Admin Units (includes training on SUOs)	Spring 2009	Purchase TracDat	
	7/30/09	Department Head Academy – Training for PPPR	Summer 2009	Begin configuration of TracDat	
1	8/14/09	College Day - Departments and Areas begin writing Program Plans and Program Reviews	Fall 2009 – Spring 2010	Upload data into TracDat; develop training materials; configure reports "ghost" PPPR process on TracDat	
2	10/1/09	PPPR Due from Departments/ Areas Submit to PR Subcommittee & Validation Teams			
3	11/2/09	Validated PPPRs due Submit to Inter-Level Work Groups (Dean/ Director Level)			
4	12/1/09	PPPRs due Submit consolidated PPPRs to VP Level Work Groups			

PPPR Paper Process			TracDat	
Step #	Date	Activity	Date	Activity
5	1/131/10 1/31 – 3/15 2010	PPPRs due to CPC CPC develops institutional priorities	Spring 2010	Gather feedback from user groups Conduct some training?
6	3/15/10	CPC sends priorities to BAC & S-P; CPC sends collegewide communication re priorities and accomplishments		
7	Early April	Work Groups re-convene for updates		
	4/15 – 5/15 2010	Evaluation of PPPR process		
			Summer 2010	Upload most recent data; refine materials & reports
			Fall 2010	Roll-out TracDat for 2010-2011 PPPR cycle

CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZATION

(Note: The specific criteria listed are not ranked or hierarchical and may all be considered equally in prioritization discussions.)

Detail of Proposal
The proposal should be defined as fully as possible, including an estimate of time to complete, person hours of time, and fiscal cost. Benefits and feasibility of the project also should be explained, including, for example, financial savings to the college or, number of students or faculty affected.

Commitment to Total Cost of Ownership
Any proposal which involves staff support requirements (additional full-time, additional part-time, available existing staff, or outside contract options) or maintenance costs must include an analysis of the budgetary needs of the project. The feasibility of meeting the costs of these requirements will be considered in the evaluation of the proposal.

Alignment with College-Wide Goals
Proposals will be looked at in the large context of the entire school, including connection to Board of Trustees' Goals, the Superintendent/President's Agenda, and the Educational Master Plan Goals. Resource requests that serve the institution as a whole may be given priority over those that benefit individual areas.

College Need Based on Internal or External Conditions
Proposals should identify the college needs which they will fulfill and the conditions that establish these needs (new regulations, local economic demands, availability of funding sources, etc.) and should explain how they will fulfill those needs. Proposals will also be reviewed for repetition of or synergy with other new or ongoing proposals or projects.

Local Context
Proposals will be evaluated regarding their impact at the department or school level, including a consideration of the consequences of not pursing the proposal. Departments' autonomy to develop their own curriculum and to pursue appropriate instructional innovations should be respected.

Need vs. Want
Resource requests that are necessary for the maintenance and continuance of a program with demonstrable student demand and currency in its field should take priority over requests intended to expand or enhance programs or create new programs.

Previously Submitted Proposals or Prioritization
If the proposal has been previously in department plans and has received consideration, or if the proposal received high priority at any planning level in a previous year but was ultimately not approved or funded, these factors should be considered.

Completion of Entire Project
Specifically for Block Grant funding requests, resources may, at the discretion of the VATEA and Block Grant Task Force, be allocated to complete a single large project rather than divided up to partially fund several smaller projects.

Instructional Program Review Questions

1. Program Status and Accomplishments

A. Program Description   (To be completed by Department/Program)
Describe your program. Include classes offered, program purpose/program mission, student population, course sequence, etc.

Program Mission/Program purpose	
Courses offered	
Course Sequence	
Student Population	
Other	

B. Program Access, Productivity and Effectiveness

		Enrollment Patterns						Efficiency				Effectiveness			
Course	Review of Outline (date)	# of sections	Location (include DL)	Time of day	# of enrollments	WSCH	FTES	Class size average	WSCH/FTEF	Ave Room Fill Rate	Average cost/FTES	Withdrawal rate	Retention rate	Success Rate	Average GPA
Autofill all fields															
Total															

C. Other program achievement data

Course/Program	Improvement rate through sequence	Licensure exam pass rate	# Degrees/Certificates Conferred	Job Placement (rate or numbers)

Summary of program access, productivity and effectiveness (briefly describe trends or student achievement data that is noteworthy or of concern)

D. Human resources to support program

a. Current Staffing structure

Type of Position	Number in Unit					
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Administration						
Full-time Faculty						
Part-time Faculty						
Faculty Reassigned time						
Classified Staff FT						
Classified Staff PT						
Confidential Staff FT						
Hourly Staff						
Student Workers						
Totals						

Include an organization chart if available.

E. Status in achieving previous unit goals/objectives

Since the last review, indicate the status of the previous 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.

Previous Major Goal and/or Objective	Status of goal (completed, ongoing, date of anticipated completion)	Evidence for goal achievement/need for improvement	Factors that impacted progress

2. Student Learning Outcomes

A. Course Student Learning Outcomes

Course	Course SLOs	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Course #1	SLO #1				
	SLO #2				
	SLO #3				
	SLO #4				
Course #2	SLO #1				
	SLO #2				

B. **Program Student Learning Outcomes.**

Course(s) that maps to Program SLO	Program SLOs	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Course #1	PLO #1				
Course #2					
Course #3					
Course #4					
Course #5	PLO #2				
Course #6					
Course #7					
Course #8	PLO #3				

C. **General Education Program Learning Outcomes**

Course	Is this course part of the G.E. program?	G.E. Outcomes	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Autofill from 2a	yes	GEO #1				
		GEO #2				
		GEO #3				
		GEO #4				
	no	--	--		--	--

D. **Institutional Level Learning Outcomes**

Course	Institutional Level Outcomes	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Autofill from 2a	ILO #1				
	ILO #2				
	ILO #3				
	ILO #4				

Summarize Student Learning Outcomes assessment results for past review cycle
(highlight notable successes and areas requiring improvement)

3. Current and Anticipated Needs and Program Goals

A. External Conditions

Identify external conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process.
Drop-down menu: external conditions include regulatory or legislative changes, grants received, changes in technology, accreditation recommendations, enrollment issues, advisory committee input, relations with transfer institutions or high schools, etc.

	Describe the External Condition	Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.
Regulatory, legislative changes		
Grants Received		
Accreditation recommendations		
Enrollment issues		
Advisory Committee input		
Community Outreach		
Relations with transfer institutions or high schools		
Changes in technology		
Labor market trends		

B. Internal Conditions

Identify internal conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process. Please include a periodic review of attached data. Note: Internal conditions include IT data, changes in technology, budget, staffing, resources, enrollment, facilities, etc.

	Describe the Internal Condition	**Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.**
Budget		
Facilities		
Faculty		
Staff		
Schedule		
Equipment		
Curriculum		
Enrollment trends		
Other		

C. Program Goals and Alignment with College Goals

State the major goals for the unit for the next cycle of review and show, where applicable, their alignment to the college mission, Educational Master Plan Goal, Superintendent-President's Agenda, accreditation planning agenda, or major college initiative. Include curriculum development or program modifications.

drop down menu of institutional goals, initiatives	**Unit Goal**

D. Goal Implementation Plan

Unit Goal	Strategies/Actions to achieve goal	Responsible Parties	Implementation Timeline	Priority	Planning	Implementing	Completed	Rationale
						Status of Implementation		
Autofill from 3 C								

E. Resources Needed to Fulfill Goals

Program Goal	Resource Category (Personnel, Professional Development, Equipment, Supplies, Consultant, Software, Consumable, Facilities)	Estimated Cost, if appropriate
Autofill from 3 B		

4. Additional Comments (250 words or less).

5. Please list names and titles of all those who participated in this program review.

Student Support Services Program Review Questions

1. Program Status, Alignment with College Goals, and Accomplishments

A. Program Description   (To be completed by Department/Program)
Describe your program. Include program title, program purpose/program mission, program services offered and student population.

Program Title	
Program Mission/Program Purpose	
Program Services Offered	
Students Served	

B. Program demand, productivity and effectiveness
Describe the services your program provided and its role in college effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Services Offered	Goal Attainment	Matriculation rate	Enrollment Rate	Certificate check	AA/AS completion rate	Transfer Rate	Degree Audit Progress	Units Audit Progress	Transfer Audit progress	Transcript Audit Requests	Student Educational Plan	FAFSA Completion rate	Precise and clear career goal	Equal Access	Persistence Rate	Other
Autofill applicable services																
Total																

Summary of program access, productivity and effectiveness (briefly describe trends or student achievement data that is noteworthy or of concern)

C. Human resources to support program

a. Current Staffing structure

Type of Position	Number in Unit					
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Administration						
Full-time Faculty						
Part-time Faculty						
Faculty Reassigned FTE Full time						
Classified Staff FT						
Classified Staff PT						
Confidential Staff FT						
Hourly Staff						
Student Workers						
Totals						

Include an organization chart if available.

D. Status in achieving previous program goals/objectives
Since the last review, indicate the status of the previous 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.

Previous Goal and/or Objective	Status of goal (completed, ongoing, date of anticipated completion)	Evidence for goal achievement/need for improvement	Factors that impacted progress

2. Student Learning Outcomes and Service Unit Outcomes

A. Student Learning Outcomes

ILO	Intended Outcomes (SLOs)	Target Population	Activities to Achieve SLO (Strategies/ Intervention)	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data (Include Baseline Data)	Use of Data for Improvements
Auto fill							

B. Service Unit Outcomes

ILO	Intended Outcomes (SUOs)	Target Population	Activities to Achieve SLO (Strategies/ Intervention)	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data (Include Baseline Data)	Use of Data for Improvements
Auto fill							

Summarize SLO and SUO assessment results for past review cycle (highlight notable successes and areas requiring improvement)

3. Current and Anticipated Needs and Program Goals

A. External Conditions

Identify external conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process. Drop-down menu: external conditions include regulatory or legislative changes, grants received, changes in technology, enrollment trend, advisory committee input, relations with transfer institutions or high schools, etc.

	Describe the External Condition	Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.
Regulatory or legislative changes		
Grants Received		
Enrollment Trend		
Advisory Committee input		
Community Outreach		
Agreements with Transfer Institution		
Changes in technology		
Other		

B. Internal Conditions

Identify internal conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process. Please include a periodic review of attached data. Note: Internal conditions include results of previous SLO assessment, IT data, changes in technology, budget, staffing, resources, enrollment, facilities, etc.

	Describe the Internal Condition	Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.
Budget		
Facilities		
Faculty		
Staff		
Schedule		
Equipment		
Institutional Priorities		
Other		

C. **Program Goals**
Include service enhancement or program modifications

Program Goal	Indicate data or other relevant information that demonstrates the need for the goal (such as SLO achievement, transfer & retention rates, etc.)

D. **Alignment with the College and Division of Student Support Services**
Briefly describe how your program goals fulfill the college mission, the division priorities and the college's Master Plan.

College and Student Support Services Division	Program Goals	Briefly describe how your program goals align with the college and the Student Support Services Division
Mission Statement		
EMPC Goals		
Division Priority #1 Achieving Educational Objective		
Division Priority #2 Learning Outcomes		
Division Priority #3 Improving Access		
Student Success Plan		
Transfer Initiative		

E. **Goal Implementation Plan**

Unit Goal	Strategies/Actions to achieve goal	Responsible Parties	Implementation Timeline	Status of Implementation				
				Priority	Planning	Implementing	Completed	Rationale
Autofill from 3 C								

F. Resources Needed to Fulfill Goals

Program Goal	Resource Category (Personnel, Professional Development, Equipment, Supplies, Consultant, Software, Consumable, Facilities)	Estimated Cost, if appropriate
Autofill from 3 C		

4. Additional Comments (250 words or less).

5. Please list names and titles of all those who participated in this program review.

Administrative Unit Program Review Questions

1. Program overview

A. Program mission or primary purpose (The mission/purpose statement must be a distinctive description of the program that identifies what the program is, what it does, and for whom it does it. Describe your program.

B. Primary functions

Function	Performed in collaboration with which units	Clients/Customers served	Indicate the location(s) served by each function (LAC/PCC/Web)	Client deliverable(s)

C. State how the function or services of your program either directly or indirectly supports student learning

Function	Describe how the function supports student learning
Auto fill from B	

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

Function	Description of data normally collected and/or reported that reflections quality/effectiveness of function

E. Human resources to support program

a. Current Staffing structure

Type of Position	Number in Unit					
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Administration						
Classified Staff FT						
Classified Staff PT						
Confidential Staff FT						
Hourly Staff						
Student Workers						
Faculty Reassigned FTE Full time						
Totals						

Include an organization chart if available.

F. Status in achieving previous unit goals/objectives

Since the last review, indicate the status of the previous 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.

Previous Major Goal and/or Objective	Status of goal (completed, ongoing, date of anticipated completion)	Evidence for goal achievement/need for improvement	Factors that impacted progress

2. A. Service Unit Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes (to be updated annually by all college units; not all areas will have student learning outcomes)

A. Service Unit Outcomes or Student Learning Outcomes
1. State functional area

Goal or ILO alignment (may be EMP, Board, President's Goals or Institutional Learning Outcome)	Intended Service Unit Outcome (or SLO, if applicable)	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results

2. State functional area

Goal or ILO alignment	Intended Service Unit Outcome (or SLO, if applicable)	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results

3. State functional area

Goal or ILO alignment	Intended Service Unit Outcome (or SLO, if applicable)	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results

Summarize Service Unit Outcomes or Student Learning Outcomes assessment results for past review cycle (highlight notable successes and areas requiring improvement)

3. **New program goals, plans for improvement, and current and anticipated needs**

    A. **External Conditions**
       Identify external conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process.
       Drop-down menu: external conditions include regulatory or legislative changes, grants received, changes in technology, accreditation recommendations, enrollment issues, advisory committee input, relations with transfer institutions or high schools, etc.

	Describe the External Condition	Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.
Regulatory, legislative changes		
Grants Received		
Accreditation recommendations/Planning agenda		
Enrollment issues		
Advisory Committee input		
Community Outreach		
Relations with transfer institutions or high schools		
Changes in technology		
Department Requests		
Institutional Initiatives		
Other		

B. Internal Conditions
Identify internal conditions that have influenced the program goal-setting process. Please include a periodic review of attached data. Note: Internal conditions include results of previous SUO or SLO assessment, IT data, changes in technology, budget, staffing, resources, enrollment, facilities, etc.

	Describe the Internal Condition	**Where appropriate, indicate section of this review that describes this situation.**
Budget		
Facilities		
Faculty		
Staff		
Schedule		
Equipment		
Curriculum		
Other		

C. Unit Goals and Alignment with College Goals
State the major goals for the unit for the next cycle of review and show, where applicable, their alignment to the college mission, Educational Master Plan Goal, Superintendent-President's Agenda, accreditation planning agenda, or major college initiative

drop down menu of institutional goals, initiatives	**Unit Goal**

D. Goal Implementation Plan

Unit Goal	Strategies/Actions to achieve goal	Responsible Parties	Implementation Timeline	Priority	Planning	Implementing	Completed	Rationale

Autofill from 3 C								

E. Resources Needed to Fulfill Goals

Unit Goal	Resource Category (Personnel, Professional Development, Equipment, Supplies, Consultant, Software, Consumable, Facilities)	Estimated Cost, if appropriate
Autofill from 3 C		

F. Additional Comments (250 words or less).

G. Please list names and titles of all those who participated in this program review.

To Be Completed by the School/Area Group led by Dean or Director

A. Alignment of College Goals/Objectives

Provide evidence of how the School/Area has supported the goals/objectives established by the Board of Trustees, Superintendent-President's agenda, and the Educational Master Plan.	
How has the School/Area supported the goals/objectives established by the departments/programs within the School/Area.	

B. Academic Quality

Provide evidence of programs/activities that support academic quality.	
Identify programs/activities that require attention. What action needs to be taken?	

C. Curriculum and Instruction

Based on labor market data and local competition, what trends are emerging that indicate new programs should be considered or current programs be reviewed?	
What major issues/concerns exist related to the curriculum and instruction? What action needs to be taken?	

D. School Effectiveness

	Current trends.	What concerns, if any, does this present?	What action, if any, is necessary?
Retention	*Autofill*		
Persistence	*Autofill*		
Success	*Autofill*		
Transfer Rates	*Autofill*		
Degrees Issued	*Autofill*		
Certificates Issued	*Autofill*		
Program SLOs	*Provide summary based on review of program level reports*		

E. Enrollment Management

	Current trends	What actions, if any, are necessary?	Comments
FTES by pay type	*Autofill*		
Class size average	*Autofill*		
WSCH/FTEF	*Autofill*		
Hourly faculty cost/FTES	*Autofill*		
Degrees Issued	*Autofill*		
Certificates Issued	*Autofill*		

F. Staffing

What are the full-time faculty staffing priorities to be submitted to the Hiring Priorities Committee?	
What are the trends of part-time faculty staffing (FTEF)?	*Autofill for previous 3-5 years*
What are the classified hiring needs/priorities?	

G. Professional Development and Training

What professional development/training activities are necessary within the School/Area in order to become more effective/efficient?

H. Budgetary Information

What capital outlay/block grant priorities exist within the School/Area which will be presented for funding consideration?	
What VTEA project priorities exist within the School/Area which will be presented for funding consideration?	
Given the current economic environment and current allocations, what budget account adjustments, if any, are recommended?	

I. Infrastructure/Facilities

What infrastructure/facilities issues exist that if corrected would improve program instruction?	
What access issues, if any, need to be addressed to address ADA requirements?	

J. Community

What outreach efforts have taken place to promote programs and departments? What are the results based on this outreach?	
What grants have been initiated to support student success?	
What economic development activities are in place to support student success?	
What internal and external partnerships have been initiated to support student success?	
What opportunities exist within the internal and external communities that should be explored?	

K. Overall Planning/Review Observations

1.a. Since the last review, identify items/actions that indicate progress and improvement.	
1.b. List major accomplishments and areas in need of improvement that are contained in the program reviews for the school.	
2.a. Since the last review, identify items/actions that require additional attention or support.	
2.b. Provide a list of projects prioritized from those proposed from the programs in the school.	
Additional comments.	*250 words or less*

L. Resources Needed to Fulfill Goals (Provide detailed information for resources needed to support priorities listed in section K above.)

Program Goal	Resource Category (Personnel, Professional Development, Equipment, Supplies, Consultant, Software, Consumable, Facilities)	Estimated Cost, if appropriate
Autofill from 3 C		

M. Please list names of the members of this workgroup.

Vice President Level Prompts

1. Alignment of College Goals/Objectives and Accomplishments

A. State the mission of your office

B. Provide a status update on progress toward achieving the goals stated in your previous review. Please include a list of significant accomplishments since the previous review as indicated by the reviews forwarded to you from the inter-level groups of your area.

2. Current and Anticipated Needs and Area Goals

A. Internal/ External Conditions

What are the trends and challenges that will impact your office during the upcoming planning and review cycle?

B. Goals and Objectives

i. What are your goals and objectives for the next planning cycle? How do they align with the goals of the Educational Master Plan, President's Agenda, Board of Trustees' Goals, major college initiatives, accreditation planning agendas, etc.?

EMP Goal/President's Agenda/Board Goal, etc. to which goal is aligned	Program Goal	Strategies/Actions to achieve goal
(drop down list)		

ii. What goals do you share with other Vice Presidents? (Please name the area with which you will collaborate.)

Goal	To be accomplished in Collaboration with
(add rows as needed)	

D. Data

In order to adequately assess the effectiveness of your area, what types of data do you plan to collect during the next year?

E. Resources Needed

What resources do you anticipate needing to achieve your goals for the next planning cycle?

Area Goal	Resource Category (Personnel, Professional Development, Equipment, Supplies, Consultant, Software, Consumable, Facilities)	Estimated Cost, if appropriate
(add rows as needed)		

3. Priorities

Please include a list of prioritized projects and their associated resource requests as determined from the reviews forwarded to you from the inter-level groups of your area.

School / Area	Priority	Resource Request
(add rows as needed)		

4. Additional Comments (250 words or less).

5. Please list names of members of this workgroup.

Inter-Level Planning Groups

These short-term task forces will be established by the College Planning Committee at the deans' level for instructional program reviews and at comparable levels when determined by the appropriate vice-president in non-instructional areas. A separate group will be formed for PCC and will submit its report to the VP of Academic Affairs.

Inter-level Planning Group Charge:

1. Compile program and department accomplishments, SLO data, proposed projects and goals, and resource requests for all departments and program within the area based on department and program plans and reviews. This information will be forwarded to the appropriate Vice-President level task force.

2. Prioritize proposed projects and resource requests based on department and program plans and reviews, response forms from the Program Review Sub-Committee or Validation Teams, and feasibility reports from appropriate areas of the college such instructional technology or the grants office. This information will be forwarded to the appropriate Vice-President level task force.

3. For instructional areas, consider the base budget for the area and the resource and budget requests from departments and programs in order to reach budget decisions for the school and develop budget augmentation requests as needed

4. At the conclusion of the process, communicate in writing to all departments in the appropriate area all decisions and priorities that have been reached and forwarded to the vice-president's level.

5. Communicate to departments and programs within the area when requests or proposals are declined, postponed, or otherwise not included as priorities in the group report sent forward to the vice-president level, offering a rationale for the decision and, when appropriate, suggestions for improving the proposal or request.

Composition of Inter-level Groups for Instructional Areas:

1. The group will be organized and co-chaired by the area dean, who will be responsible for calling the first meeting and ensuring the progress of the group's work.

2. One or two faculty members from each department within the area, depending on the department's preference. These faculty members will be chosen by their own departments. Department head participation is encouraged but not required, as the department head may designate a departmental point person for program planning and review. The departmental representatives to the groups will be responsible for carrying input from and reporting back to their departments regarding the discussions and decisions of the group.

3. The academic administrative assistant for the area, as well as any additional appropriate staff members as agreed upon by the school.

4. At the first meeting of the group, the departmental faculty members will select one of the faculty representatives present to serve as co-chair for the group. This selection may take place by consensus or by election during the meeting.

Composition of Inter-level Groups for Non-Instructional Areas:

To be determined by the appropriate vice-president and will include representatives for each of the functional areas included in the program review process.

Approved by the CPC on May 21, 2009

Proposed Composition of PCC Inter-level Group*:

1. The group will be organized and co-chaired by the AVP of PCC and by a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate.

2. Four additional PCC faculty members, including a Counselor, a Librarian and an instructor who works in the Student Success Center.

3. One representative from Facilities.

4. One representative from Instructional and Information Technology Services.

5. The Dean of Academic Services.

6. The Dean of Student Success.

7. One representative from PCC Admissions and Records.

8. One representative from PCC Financial Aid ?

The PCC Inter-level Group will answer the VP Level Prompts and submit its report to the VP of Academic Services

Vice-President Level Planning Groups

Five short-term task forces will be established by the College Planning Committee, one each for the Vice-Presidents of Academic Affairs, Student Support Services, Administrative Services, Economic and Resource Development, and Human Resources.

Vice-President Level Planning Group Charge:

6. Compile program and department accomplishments, SLO data, proposed projects and goals, and resource requests based on reports from inter-level groups or, if no inter-level groups are established within a given area, based on department and program plans and reviews. This information will be forwarded to the College Planning Committee.

7. Prioritize proposed projects and resource requests based on reports from inter-level groups or, if no inter-level groups are established within a given area, based on department and program plans and reviews and response forms from validation teams. The Academic Affairs group will also consider input forwarded by the Curriculum Committee. The final report of the vice-president level group will be forwarded to the College Planning Committee.

8. Communicate to departments and programs within the area when requests of proposals are not prioritized, offering a rationale for the decision and, when appropriate, suggestions for improving the proposal or request.

9. At the conclusion of the process, each group will communicate in writing to all departments in its area all decisions and priorities that have been reached and forwarded to the College Planning Committee.

Composition of Vice-President Level Planning Groups:

5. The group will be organized and co-chaired by the area vice-president and by a faculty member appointed by the academic senate. The co-chairs will be jointly responsible for calling the first meeting and ensuring the progress of the group's work.

6. Additional representatives from administration, faculty, and staff as determined by the CPC. Group members should include reasonable representation for all areas under the specific vice-president's purview. All representatives to the group will be responsible for carrying input from and reporting back to the areas they represent regarding the discussions and decisions of the group.

Approved by the CPC on May 21, 2009

Program Review Validation Response Form

Purpose of Validation:
- _To confirm the satisfactory completion of the program review document_
- _Where appropriate, to offer recommendations to the program or department regarding improvement or refinement of departmental processes, goals, projects, and presentation and analysis of evidence._
- _Where appropriate, to offer guidance to the department regarding the scope and depth of future program reviews._

When completed, this response form will be returned to the department from which the program review initiated. A copy of the form will also be forwarded to the appropriate area dean or vice-president for use in further stages of the planning process.

Department or Program: _____

Feedback questions	Yes	No	Comments
1. Does the plan contain primary contact person and information?			
2. Does the review reflect broad involvement of the members of the department or program in the review process?			
3. Does the plan provide a concise mission/purpose statement for the program?			
4. Does the plan adequately evaluate progress on previous primary program goals/objectives?			
5. Has the program review been completed with adequate detail?			
• Is each topic relevant to the department or program addressed adequately?			
• Does the review provide data or evidence to support all conclusions reached?			
• Does the review establish clear connections to college goals or initiatives and to the college mission?			

Feedback questions	Yes	No	Comments
6. Does the review demonstrate the department or program's thoughtful reflection on past efforts and dedication to improvement?			
7. Does the review reflect any specific accomplishments for which the department or program should be commended?			
8. Should any of the planned strategies or projects indicated in the review receive special emphasis from the department or program or from the college as a whole?			
9. Does the review indicate that the department/ program has developed appropriate learning outcomes or service unit outcomes?			
10. Does the review indicate that the department/ program has effective processes in place for assessing those outcomes?			
11. Does the review indicate that the department/ program is using assessment data to make changes designed to improve student learning?			
12. In what ways, if any, should the department/ program seek to improve in terms of learning outcome or service unit outcome development and assessment?			
13. In what ways could the department's or program's reviews be strengthened in future review cycles (for example, with expanded scope or depth, with greater or more detailed evidence, etc)?			

Reviewers: _____

Date: _____

<div align="center">**Program Planning/Program Review Process Evaluation**</div>

In the spring of each year, at the conclusion of the planning and review process, the College Planning Committee will establish a Planning and Review Process Evaluation Task Force. In Spring 2010, the charge of this Task Force will be fulfilled by the Program Planning and Review Implementation Task Force.

Planning and Review Process Evaluation Task Force charge:

1. Collect data via web-based survey from all college constituent groups involved in the planning and review process. This data should include information on participation levels and perceived effectiveness of the process at all levels and from all areas of the college. Individuals surveyed should include the following:

   - Planning and review task force co-chairs and members

   - CPC members

   - Department heads

   - Program Review Sub-Committee members

   - Validation Team members

   - Staff who support instruction, student support services, and administration

   - Faculty and staff who were not members of planning and review task forces

2. Analyze data collected in step one and conduct further research, possibly through focus group interviews, as necessary to identify reasons for any dissatisfaction or lack of involvement in the process and areas and aspects of the process that can be improved.

3. Forward conclusions regarding the planning and review process and recommendations for improvement to the College Planning Committee.

Planning and Review Process Evaluation Task Force Composition:

1. An administrative co-chair appointed by the Superintendent/President.

2. A faculty co-chair appointed by the academic senate.

3. Additional representatives from administration, faculty, and staff as determined by the CPC. These representatives should be selected to provide a broad range of perspectives and experience regarding planning and review from throughout the college.

<div align="right">Approved by the CPC on May 21, 2009</div>

Program Planning and Review Implementation Task Force

In order to oversee the implementation of the program planning and review process in its first year, the College Planning Committee should establish an implementation task force. This task force will monitor the planning and review process and bring any issues that arise to the attention to the CPC co-chairs. The task force itself will be empowered with no decision-making authority. At the conclusion of the 2009-2010 planning cycle, the task force will be disbanded.

Implementation Task Force Charge:
4. Monitor the timely completion of documents at all stages of the planning and review process in 2009-2010
5. Advise planning task forces on technical issues regarding the process as necessary.
6. In consultation with appropriate administrators, propose to the CPC memberships for inter-level and vice-president level task forces that have not yet been defined.
7. Monitor the implementation of the TracDat computer software system.
8. In consultation with the Human Resources' Staff Development Office and with Faculty Professional Development, develop training and staff development activities and materials necessary for the implementation of the planning and review process.
9. In Spring 2010, fulfill the charge of the Planning and Review Process Evaluation Task Force by implementing and monitoring the evaluation process.

Implementation Task Force Membership:
- Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, who will serve as the task force co-chair
- Two faculty members appointed by the academic senate. One of these faculty members will serve as co-chair of the task force.
- Current Faculty Professional Development Coordinator (until term ends)
- Incoming Faculty Professional Development Coordinator
- Director of Applications Development and Support or designee
- Planning Analyst
- Staff Development Coordinator

Approved by the CPC on May 21, 2009