

DISTRICT PROGRAM REVIEW: REVISING THE PROCESS

Jeremiah A. Gilbert, Ph.D.

Executive Director - Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

San Bernardino Community College District



SETTING THE STAGE

- In 2017, the San Bernardino Community College District set about revising its Program Review process. This came about after receiving feedback from:
 - The District Program Review Committee;
 - The district's ACCJC Ad-hoc Task Force;
 - A Partnership Resource Team (PRT) visit; and
 - Reviewing the district's Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Outcomes



EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW



- The district already had a planning process and committee in place.
- Existing process was annual and included a progress report on prior year's goals, objectives, and actions.
- The district's two colleges had strong Program Review processes that could be leveraged.



EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW



- The district committee had no campus representatives.
- The district process did not align with the colleges and was long and convoluted.
- The district process did not meaningfully factor in campus strategic goals or district initiatives.



EXISTING PROGRAM REVIEW



- The district process did not include Service Area Outcomes.
- The district process was neither open nor transparent.
- The colleges felt the district got whatever they wanted while they needed to jump through hoops.



THE CHARGE

- Refocus district Program Review to be student and college centered.
- Strengthen ties between campus and district Program Review.
- Align district Resource Requests with campus strategic goals and district initiatives.
- Increase the amount of qualitative and quantitative data available with an emphasis on productivity and staffing.
- Develop and assess Service Area Outcomes.
- Improve reporting and communication.



FIRST STEPS

- Add campus representation to the District Program Review Committee:
 - One faculty member from each campus (Planning and Program Review Committee members preferred)
 - One classified staff member from each campus (Planning and Program Review Committee members preferred)
 - One Student Senate representative from each campus
- Alignment of Program Review processes



ALIGNMENT OF PROCESSES

- Issues to address:
 - District planning was concurrent with campus planning cycles
 - District planning was based on campus needs from the prior year
 - Campuses were developing new Resource Requests before knowing the District response to the previous year's requests
- The district shifted its timeline so that the bulk of district Program Review takes place between May and September, after campus Program Review cycles are complete and results are available, and before campuses begin their next Program Review cycle.



THE REVISED PROCESS

- District Program Review now consists of a thorough evaluation of district support services on a four-year rotation that includes a 4-Year Self-Evaluation and 2-Year Program Update that every program must complete.
- In addition, there is an annual Resource Request application process that programs may participate in depending upon need.
- The 4-Year Self-Evaluation and 2-Year Program Update provide a foundation for Resource Requests. The narratives of these larger documents can be used to support each request.



4-YEAR SELF-EVALUATION

- The 4-Year Self-Evaluation includes:
 - Mission and Service Area Outcomes
 - Reflection on the mission, purpose, and services provided by the program and how they support the campuses and the district
 - Analysis of qualitative and quantitative data that demonstrates how well the program is fulfilling its mission, purpose, services, and Service Area Outcomes
 - Accomplishments, opportunities, challenges, and trends
 - Short-term and long-term vision and planning objectives



2-YEAR PROGRAM UPDATE

- The requirements and needs for district support services can change in a short period of time based on education trends, grant funding, and changes to state, federal, and accreditation requirements.
- The 2-Year Program Update provides programs the opportunity to reflect how these changes impact their areas and update their vision, goals, and objectives accordingly.
- The 2-Year Program Update focuses on changes in productivity, staffing, and trends, and updates program progress on or changes to the program's vision, goals, and objectives.



EVALUATION RUBRIC

- An evaluation rubric was developed so that programs completing their 4-Year Self-Evaluations and 2-Year Program Updates would have a set of criteria that includes descriptions of levels of performance quality for each criteria, in this case “meets” or “does not meet.”
- This evaluation rubric is also used by the District Program Review Committee when assessing the evaluations and updates submitted by programs in that year’s rotation.



RESOURCE REQUESTS

District programs may choose to submit one or more Resource Request applications for personnel, budget, or equipment/technology to improve program services. Programs should justify the need for each request by:

- Clearly linking the request to improving student learning
- Incorporating productivity and staffing data to support the request
- Demonstrating how the request will help the program achieve the program's vision, goals, and objectives
- Tying the program request to specific campus program review results, if applicable
- Clearly linking the request to district and campus Master Planning



DIVISION RANKINGS

- Each district program with more than one Resource Request is asked to rank their requests.
- The programs within each district division are then asked to rank all requests within their division and it is these division rankings, along with their accompanying Resource Requests applications, that go to the District Program Review Committee for an overall district Resource Request prioritization.



PRIORITIZING RESOURCE REQUESTS

All Resource Requests are prioritized through thorough group discussion and consensus of the District Program Review Committee. The following criteria is used to guide the prioritization:

- Impact on students
- Mandated activities related to facilities and safety
- Accreditation requirements
- Innovation
- Impact on quality and comprehensiveness of program
- The vision, mission, and values of the district
- Campus Master Plans and District Strategic Plan
- Service levels



PRIORITIZING RESOURCE REQUESTS

- Once the District Program Review Committee has completed their overall district resource rankings, the rankings are sent to the District Budget Committee as an information item before being sent to the Chancellor's Cabinet for final review.
- Chancellor's Cabinet reviews the resource rankings from the District Program Review Committee and approves the final resource prioritization. A rationale is provided to the district community that explains any changes made by the Chancellor's Cabinet to the District Program Review Committee's prioritized list.



COMMUNICATION

- The District Program Review Committee reports out to campus and district constituencies on District Program Review results including:
 - What departments submitted 4-Year Self-Evaluations and 2-Year Updates
 - Results of Resource Request prioritization, including how requests tie to campus program reviews results, master planning goals and initiatives
 - Communicate what Resource Requests were funded by the district



COMMUNICATION

- As a means to promote communication and transparency, the District Program Review website has been revised and updated.
- Links can be found that include each year's submitted 4-Year Self-Evaluations and 2-Year Program Updates, along with each division's ranking of Resource Requests and their programs original Resource Request applications.
- All documents used for the process can also be found on the website, along with the 2018-2022 District Support Services Program Review Plan developed during this time.



LESSONS LEARNED

- Need to distinguish anticipated expenditures as either Operational or Program Review. Operational expenditures are defined as being part of the normal operation of programs and should be included in program budgets during the regular budget development cycle and not go through Program Review.
- Further information necessary regarding Service Area Outcomes, particularly how they differ from goals and the assessment aspect of them. Guidelines were developed and now accompany 4-Year Program Self-Evaluations.



QUESTIONS?



Contact:

Jeremiah A. Gilbert, Executive Director
Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
San Bernardino Community College District

<http://www.sbccd.org/research>

Artwork:

Timothy Anderson Design

