The Task Force on Program Review

March 2, 2006

Background

A small taskforce was convened by the Curriculum Committee with the charge to review the program review process and make recommendations for enhancing the overall effectiveness of Program Review at Skyline College.

Task Force Members

- Christine Roumbanis
- Cathy Hasson
- Ray Hernandez
- Sherri Hancock

- Arthur Takayama
- Regina Stanback-Stroud
- Jim Bowsher
- Lori Adrian

Process Used

The taskforce held a series of meetings during Fall 05 and Spring 06 semesters. Those meetings were held on: 9/28/05, 10/21/05, 2/9/06, and 3/2/06.

The group reviewed models from the following colleges:

1. Irvine Valley College
2. Sierra College
3. Saddleback College
4. San Diego Mesa College

The group focused on the following areas of the review

1. Process
2. Timeline
3. Faculty Development
4. Communication
5. Forms/Tools

Recommendations

The taskforce is making the following recommendations to the Curriculum Committee. We believe these recommendations will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the program review process, align the review with the accreditation standards and facilitate the use of the findings in informing the allocation of human, fiscal and physical resources.

1. The program review cycle should be revised to coincide with the Accreditation cycle. A comprehensive program review should be conducted by every department on a six year cycle based on a rotation schedule maintained by the Office of Instruction. A focused mid-term report should be performed after three years. This report should provide information regarding progress on the program review planning agenda items.

2. The Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness should prepare A summary report of the completed program reviews. The summary should coincide with the four accreditation standards and be tied to the college year-end report.

3. A series of communications should be implemented in the program review process that includes but is not limited to:

    a. Start of Review Cycle

        i.   Notice from the Office of Instruction to faculty via the Division Dean reminding departments to begin program review

        ii. Notice from the Deans to Faculty reminding departments to begin program review

        iii. Notice from the Curriculum Committee to departments announcing program review workshops for departments commencing reviews

        iv. Notice from the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness to departments inviting dialogue/meeting about data needs

    b. Mid-Cycle

        i.   Notice from the Curriculum Committee inviting questions and assessing progress

        ii. Data from the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness

        iii. Notice from the Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness announcing workshop on use of data

        iv. Notice from the Office of Instruction reminding departments of necessary course outline revisions

Page 2 of 3

      v. Notice from the SLO Coordinator or Division representative offering assistance with writing student learning outcomes

    c. <u>End of Review Cycle</u>

      i. Notice from the Curriculum Committee announcing presentation workshop

      ii. Notice from the Office of Instruction announcing presentation schedule

4. The suggested timeline for program review should be revised to include more detailed benchmarks that allow faculty to gauge their progress in relationship to the overall cycle. Examples of benchmarks are

    a. Teams should be formed by ___

    b. A team leader should be selected by ___

    c. The team should perform the data analysis by___

    d. A first draft should be prepared by ___

5. An implementation packet that includes planning and organizing tools and forms should be created and distributed to each department undergoing program review. The use of the packet should be included in the workshops.

6. The program review should not be considered complete until all of the necessary components are completed including the process evaluation survey.

7. The response to the program review should be revised to be a single response from developed by the curriculum committee with input from the appropriate vice president and the director of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness. The signature line should include the Curriculum Committee, the Vice President and the President.

8. The taskforce should continue its work to revise the forms and questions regarding program review.

9. Brown Bag Showcase seminars should be scheduled to allow for expanded opportunity to discuss the program and its findings.

10. The timeline of the program review cycle should be changed as attached.