

Program Review 2015 Planning Summary

Introduction

Program Review is the process through which Santa Monica College ensures that every program, department, administrative and support unit engages in ongoing self-evaluation thereby directly supporting the College Mission as a measure of institutional effectiveness through the lens of each program. The review process is structured with specific prompts to which programs must respond, including demonstrating how program goals and functions support and align with the institutional mission.

Programs must analyze data (provided by Institutional Research or other sources) to support assertions of program effectiveness and identify areas of improvement. Institutional Research provides a common dataset to instructional programs, works with student and instructional support programs to design specialized data collection tools, and assists administrative programs to identify and assess appropriate measurable outcomes. All programs are asked to report on outcomes assessments and describe any program response to the results. The institutional Effectiveness Committee has developed tools to help programs create and measure outcomes and reviews the outcomes and assessments of programs undergoing a six-year review.

The program review process and the documentation it provides is a major resource for institutional planning, decision-making, and resource allocation. Through identification of overarching trends and needs noted in the annual Program Review Planning Summary of all programs, the process contributes to framing institutional discussion around institutional effectiveness and goal setting for student learning and achievement.

Each program submits comprehensive reports to the Academic Senate Joint Program Review Committee every six years for thorough review; abbreviated reports are submitted annually. For CTE programs the annual reviews supplant the biennial reports previously required. Annual reports are reviewed in their entirety by the appropriate area vice president, while the Program Review Committee reviews an aggregated report of planning fields. Collectively these reports and reviews form the basis of the annual Program Review Summary submitted to the District Planning and Advisory Committee (DPAC), which uses the report to inform institutional planning.

The Program Review Annual Planning Summary, unlike more targeted reports such as the Technology or Facilities plans generated by other institutional planning bodies, presents an institutional overview identifying overarching trends and needs, contributing to an integrated planning process. To provide the most current information, the report covers a calendar year rather than an academic year. Thus, this report includes reviews submitted during Spring and Fall of 2014 as well as specific aggregated information from annual reports. During its annual review of the process and six-year rotation schedule, the committee decided to pair certain programs under broader headings with

the thought that this would allow a broader view to strengthen and better inform institutional planning. Several of these pairings were scheduled for review in Fall 2014. Some pairings worked well as intended and others proved not so synergistic as anticipated. The committee will revisit these pairings and headings for the next cycle.

After several years of content revision and format development, the Spring/Fall 2014 program review cycle was launched on CurricUNET, an on-line platform already in use by the College for curriculum management. Concurrent with the implementation of the on-line format for the six-year report, the annual program review process was implemented. Adding an annual report ensures that the collection of current data, needs, and other information from all programs is consistent and therefore more easily integrated into institutional planning. The advantage of the CurricUNET system is easy accessibility to all reports, the ability for programs to pull forward certain elements from previous reports, easier continuous documentation, and the generation of reports from specific fields across all programs. The system includes a notification process that alerts not only the program review chair that a report has been submitted and is ready for review, but also the appropriate area vice president and the chairs of the Curriculum Committee (to verify that all curriculum for an instructional program is up to date) and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (to verify SLO/UO currency and effectiveness). This notification system adds additional levels of review and inclusion in planning processes, other than the program review committee itself.

To prepare for the transition to the new on-line system, and the added requirement for an annual report, a core group of the Program Review Committee has developed a library of tools to assist programs. These include a number of self-guided training and frequently asked questions documents available on the Program Review website, as well as content-based explanations for each program review prompt accessible by clicking on the help button in each prompt field in CurricUNET and useful tips placed in the help boxes found on most pages in the CurricUNET website.

In the inaugural year of using CurricUNET and submitting annual reports, programs had the option to submit reports using the website or submitting the report in an electronic file format. As this was a beta-testing year for annual reports there were a variety of reasons not all programs submitted one. Thus the aggregated information across all programs is not as complete as possible. Going forward it is an institutional expectation that all programs will submit annual reports using CurricUNET. The committee chair and co-chair have also offered multiple on-ground training sessions and regularly meet individually with programs upon request.

The Program Review Committee has been fortunate to have members who have served for multiple years, providing history and continuity giving the committee a base for identifying issues and concerns shared by more than one program. The committee spends many hours in thoughtful review, giving feedback to programs and discussing how this information can contribute to institutional planning. Adding the annual report increases the depth and completeness of the information that will be reviewed and considered by the committee and forwarded to DPAC and other planning bodies through the Planning Summary and the all programs reports. The process of sharing of these reports as well as collaboration and input from the Institutional Effectiveness and

Curriculum Committees are evidence of institutional and planning committee efforts to ensure planning is truly integrated.

For example, four of the 2013-14 *Master Plan for Education* objectives can be linked to four program review recommendations; six 2014-15 *Master Plan for Education* objectives incorporated recommendations from the 2014 Program Review Summary. Additionally, recommendations from program review which do not reach the level of institutional objectives are often referred to an appropriate committee or operational unit to be addressed. Of the 2014-15 program review recommendations, four were already in progress at the time of DPAC review, seven were referred to other areas or bodies, and two had been completed. The new cross-program reports that will be generated from the annual program review reports will provide another layer of aggregated information focused on specific areas such as technology, facilities, and staffing, that will be used by multiple planning bodies. While the Program Review Committee does not specifically allocate resources, program review is the institutional process by which much of the information used to determine resource allocation is gathered, reviewed, and presented.

Resource allocation is a direct result of institutional planning. Keeping resource allocation separate from the program review process has strengthened the roles of both the Program Review Committee and other planning committees and bodies and more comprehensively integrates planning at Santa Monica College. Evidence of this can be found in the successful and highly regarded process for hiring new full-time faculty. A committee of faculty and administrators, using data and information culled from multiple sources, including Program Review summaries, weighs both objective and subjective factors in a long and thoughtfully considered rating process that results in submission of a list to the college president of the recommended disciplines to receive a full-time faculty hire in the coming year.

It is worthy of note that the Program Review Committee membership and resource structure includes representatives from Institutional Research and the Curriculum and the Institutional Effectiveness Committees. This ensures strong communication, exchange of information, and review between the various bodies and contributes to integrated institutional planning and alignment of recommendations and efforts between these groups.

Committee Membership

Chair: Jamey Anderson, Faculty, Physical Science

Vice Chair: Katharine Muller, Administrator, Academic Affairs

Faculty

Sara Brewer, Communications & Media Studies (Spring 2014)

Sandra Burnett, DSPPS

Lin-San Chou, Music

Jinan Darwiche, CSIS

Sharon Jaffe, ESL

William Lancaster, Design Technology

Sandra Rowe, Psychological Services (Fall 2014)

Mark Tomasic, Dance (Spring 2014)

Administrators

Hannah Lawler, Institutional Research *

Randal Lawson, Executive Vice President (Spring 2014)

Erica LeBlanc, Academic Affairs *

Laurie McQuay-Peninger, Grants (Fall 2014)

Resources

Daniel Berumen, Staff, Institutional Research

Guido Del Piccolo, Faculty, Philosophy & Social Science **

*Also serves on Institutional Effectiveness Committee

**Curriculum Committee Chair

Programs Reviewed and Reports Accepted Spring & Fall 2014

The following programs submitted a full program review report Spring or Fall 2014 and all were accepted by the committee:

- Black Collegians
- Business
- Campus and Alumni Relations
- Campus Police
- Distance Education
- Enrollment Services (Admissions, Assessment, Bursars)
- History
- Information Technology
- Music
- Philosophy & Social Science
- Physical Science
- Outreach & Recruitment

2014 Recommendations for Institutional Support for Specific Programs

Executive summaries for all programs reviewed in Spring and Fall 2014 are included in this report. In addition to a narrative, the executive summaries include commendations, recommendations for program strengthening, and, if applicable, recommendations for institutional support. Recommendations for institutional support are listed here for as documentation for consideration in institutional planning processes and do not reflect any items that have been already addressed or are currently in the process of being addressed since the committee's review of the individual program:

1. Review the benefits and outcomes of service learning and determine the level of commitment and resources the institution wishes to direct toward expanding participation. (Philosophy & Social Science)
2. Explore the ways in which the need for a Chemical Hygiene Officer can best be addressed. (Physical Science)
3. Given the increase in online enrollments and use of CMS systems and tools, review staffing needs to maintain the desired level of service and what additional

support will be needed to participate in the Chancellor's Office Open Education Initiative. (Distance Education)

4. Evaluate and plan for a timely District response to state authorization reciprocity agreement legislation, if passed. (Distance Education)
5. Develop a strategic plan, including resource allocations, to respond to new mandates such as the requirement for the Bursars Office to switch to a chip-n-pin card payment system and the Assessment Center to implement the new mandated common assessment tool. (Enrollment Services)
6. Acknowledge the increasing demand for technology maintenance and new technology, the impact of inconsistent state funding, and establish a base line in the budget to support technology maintenance and infrastructure. (Information Technology)
7. Ensure Total Cost of Ownership is factored into budgeting, planning, and procurement. (Information Technology)
8. Consider acquisition of portable technology to enable the delivery of services by Outreach counselors at any location. (Outreach & Recruitment)
9. Include upgraded or new facilities for Campus Police in long-range facilities planning. (Campus Police)

Recommendations of the Committee Based on Overarching Trends/Needs

Every year issues of concern to more than one program emerge through reports submitted and committee discussion. Many issues identified in previous Program Review Planning Summary reports have been addressed through incorporation into *Master Plan for Education* objectives or been referred to planning bodies or administrative/operational areas. New this year is the spread sheet of issues (attached to this report) identified in the annual reports as currently needing addressing or that will need to be addressed in the future. Those issues that appear to have a broader or more overarching impact for planning purposes have also been included in the overarching trends. Although annual needs identification spread sheet is not a request for resource allocations, it will be shared those committees and bodies engaged in institutional planning to provide another source of information. Recommendations are grouped under broad headings aligned with the institutional planning and support structure.

Outcomes, Assessment, Evaluation

All courses have and assess student learning outcomes (SLOs). These are recorded as part of the course outline of record in the CurricUNET curriculum management system, and are expected to be listed on individual instructor course syllabi, although there is at present no systematic way to ensure this is being done. Course and counseling SLOs are assessed every semester and recorded in the SMC developed ISIS portal. As all SLOs are directly linked to the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), both SLO and ILO data is collected and assessed. Creating the capture and tracking of SLO assessment outcomes in the SMC proprietary ISIS portal links SLO data with individual student data. A separate portal to collect administrative unit outcomes and non-counseling and academic support services SLOs is in development. An especially prescient outcome of developing this SLO portal using ISIS is the ability to disaggregate data demographically, now required to be included in SLO reporting, but more importantly

from an institutional perspective, is able to inform research, planning and decision-making.

For example, as the College moves forward with specific plans to address the student equity gap, analysis of longitudinal SLO data revealed gaps in performance outcomes for African-American and Hispanic students existed even in college level courses suggesting the gap in outcomes performance may be attributed to factors other than English and math preparedness. Thus, a recommendation of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to investigate and implement strategies to increase learning outcomes of African-American and Hispanic students is echoed by many instructional programs eager for strategies and support for the same purpose. Multiple proposals from a variety of programs to develop pilot programs to decrease the equity gap have been funded.

The Office of Institutional Research produces regular reports, standardized data sets and special reports for program undergoing review. Recently expanded staffing has increased the ability of the IR office to provide both institutional and program data and reports, thereby supporting institutional planning and accreditation expectations that the institution demonstrate that planning and decision-making are data driven. At the same time it has whetted the appetite of programs for additional, more targeted data to inform program planning.

Currently, the college has institution-set standards for all college-level student success metrics on the college's Institutional Effectiveness Dashboard. Included in the new accreditation standards defined by ACCJC is a requirement that for all instructional programs the College define institution-set standards for program-level success metrics, such as course completion. Program-level set standards reflect the satisfactory performance of student learning and achievement and are treated as the "minimum" acceptable performance. In order to fully comply with this accreditation standard the discussion of program-level set standards will need to be integrated into the current annual program review process, where programs will have the opportunity to identify program-level set standards for course success, course retention, degrees and certificates awarded, and other relevant student success metrics, analyze performance relative to the standards, and develop a plan to meet the standards if they are not met.

1. Develop guidelines for defining program-level success metrics, a timetable for instructional programs to implement and assess these standards, and integrate this reporting into the program review process.

Technology & Equipment

Across all programs, the expressed need for and concern about the College's ability to keep pace with the demand for technology increases every year. After several years of budget cutbacks, which also included reduced or no state funding in major categories like technology, there is a greater sense of almost universal urgency around technology maintenance and upgrades. Instructional programs are desperate for computer replacements to keep up with industry demands and software operational capacity while

support programs and administrative units find that computers and peripherals are so old they are failing and/or efficiency is noticeably impacted.

Technology is ubiquitous, rapidly advancing and is constantly changing the backbone of most College operations and function. From data collection and record keeping, to systems that facilitate every process, to hardware and software used in instruction and operations, to classroom technology, to infrastructure support, the dependence on technology and the expectation that the College will provide and support these needs far exceeds staffing ability and budget allocations.

Information Technology has done a remarkable job of addressing needs (infrastructure, programming, security, networking) within budget and staffing constraints and has been fortunate in recent months to increase staff, but the need to maintain, replace and upgrade technology as well as to develop new applications and systems, expand capacity and access, and respond to increasing expectations far outstrips resources. Additionally, programs that are technology heavy require targeted instructional support, both to keep instructional systems and equipment running and to support students. Lean years, coupled with a growth in technology use and sophistication of equipment implemented to keep programs current, have exacerbated needs. For CTE programs especially, Perkins funding may provide a funding source to address new equipment needs, but not to support ongoing technology support staff and technology replacement or maintenance.

Several years ago a line item was added to the District budget for technology, although it was funded only for the initial year. As programs increasingly express their concern about their inability to operate effectively and efficiently with the current state of existing technology a consistent, guaranteed baseline of funding seems necessary. A corresponding issue is related to supporting technology and technology users, especially for instructional programs. Support staff job descriptions in areas where the technology in use is new or rapidly changing are often obsolete. New job descriptions need to be created and training/re-training for staff to upgrade skills is included in planning and any Total Cost of Ownership formulas developed.

Another issue mentioned by multiple programs, especially those responsible for implementing and maintaining support and service, is a concern that Total Cost of Ownership should be factored into procurement. While it is recognized that procurement guidelines and requirements must be adhered to, there are concerns that lowest price choices have resulted in greater demands on staff time in the long run and incompatibility with existing equipment or practice.

2. Develop a plan for a more consistent baseline of funding for technology, infrastructure, and the staff needed to maintain and support all areas of the College.
3. Explore means for including Total Cost of Ownership in procurement processes.
4. Ensure job descriptions are updated and staff training is supported where needed.

Facilities

The College is fortunate to have garnered voter support for multiple bond measures in recent years, the results of which are visible on the main campus and at satellite sites in the many completed and ongoing construction projects. Nevertheless, many programs have identified facilities maintenance and upgrade/replacement concerns along with pleas for additional or specialized space. Funding for maintenance and repair of facilities as well as staffing has suffered in recent years with the result that daily and long-term maintenance is falling below acceptable standards. With so many new construction projects nearing completion in the next couple of years the College will need to budget for appropriate maintenance and operational costs as well as develop new job descriptions to support the advanced systems incorporated into these buildings.

Many programs voice a need for additional space as their staffing and/or service base grows. While at the moment, due to current construction, there is very little underused space at the College, often the issue is lack space contiguous to that already occupied by a program in need of expansion space. One example of a space need that is limiting program expansion that has a broad institutional impact is Supplemental Instruction (SI). Based on national research and institutional data from a pilot SI project, the College institutionalized Supplemental Instruction as an effective strategy for improving student success. The SI model is built on direct out-of-class interaction between the SI tutor and students in a particular class. While it was initially to support students in English and Math courses, the demand for SI tutors in these disciplines and from many disciplines continues to grow. Currently these sessions are scheduled on a space-available basis in classrooms when there is an open time slot. As this is often a moving target, even a single dedicated space for SI sessions would allow the program to address some consistent level of demand. As the college institutionalizes new programs, addresses mandates, or identifies areas for expansion, these decisions often impact facilities resources.

Another space need voiced by multiple programs, especially those areas in which adjunct faculty have required office hours, is dedicated space in which those required office hours can take place and/or be scheduled. This is especially true for faculty who classes are scheduled on satellite sites where their departments have no offices and who then wish to meet their students on site. As the College already meets or exceeds state office space formulas, addressing expressed office space needs is not a simple proposition.

Bond funded construction in recent years has resulted in several new buildings, renovations and upgrades. These do not come without inconvenience, as the College is land-challenged and lacks the space to keep programs in place while new facilities are built; and many programs and areas are outgrowing current space and/or express a desperate need for retrofitting and upgrading of older facilities. These needs far outstrip the projects identified in the various bond measures, and the efforts and budgets of Facilities Maintenance and Operations. Annual program review reports, especially the current and future needs fields will become an important source for documenting facilities needs and support planning.

Many programs identified facilities issues in the needs fields of the annual program review. Issues raised range from small items that should be handled through the work

order process which may not have been addressed due to Facilities Operations and Maintenance staffing or budget shortfalls, to projects of a much larger scope. Tenants of older buildings are feeling the limitations of older infrastructure and the need for significant upgrades or replacement. As the College considers the feasibility of proposing another bond measure it may be appropriate to update the past facilities assessments.

With the number of new building projects scheduled to come on line in the next couple of years it will be necessary for the College to plan for the staffing and knowledge skill levels needed to support these newer and more complex buildings. State funding for maintenance has fluctuated wildly in recent years making planning erratic at best. It is understood that emergency repairs will always be the priority. However, developing a basic maintenance and replacement cycle for buildings and furnishings (such the one being created for technology) would enhance planning and budgeting and provide a basis for allocations in years the state budgets funds for maintenance and instructional equipment.

5. Identify dedicated or regularly available space for SI sessions to take place.
6. Develop a Facilities Operations and Maintenance budget and staffing plan to support new buildings and projects as they come on line.
7. Develop a baseline maintenance and replacement cycle for buildings and furnishings.
8. Review previous facilities assessments, determine the need for updating, and consider this information in developing a bond proposal.

Equity, Student Success, and Student Support

The College has long demonstrated a belief that strong student support programs positively impact student success through such actions as hiring significantly more counseling positions than other community colleges, encouraging innovative support programs, and supporting ongoing dialogue around student success and equity. Fortunately, in the current fiscal year a significant increase in state funding specifically earmarked for equity and student success was allocated. Thoughtful planning and solicitation of proposals is allowing student and instructional support programs to develop pilot interventions and strategies aimed at targeted populations. These projects range from connecting directly with students in various ways to building systems and infrastructure capacity. Evaluation is built into each effort with the intent to scale those strategies and programs that prove most effective. As with every funded effort there is uncertainty around the ability of the institution to maintain the best strategies should state equity and student success funding decrease or evaporate.

Student Equity and improving the success and retention rates of African-American and Hispanic students is of concern at many levels. It has served as the unifying theme of the Fall 2014 Opening Day and the Spring 2015 Flex Day activities, it is a board priority, and is the focus of *Master Plan for Education* objectives. Many instructional programs have voiced concern about the disparities in student retention and success and have engaged in thoughtful discussion on strategies to improve program rates. While not all strategies have proven to have a significant impact there is clearly a desire for support

and campus-wide dialogue. The Student Equity Task Force is shepherding this dialogue and, through new state funding, is supporting numerous pilot strategies. The emergence of state funding specifically directed at equity improvement provides a level of support not previously available to innovate and scale-up successful strategies. It also serves to intensify focus and broaden discussion and participation to effect change.

9. Develop a process for determining priorities for maintaining the most successful support efforts should state funding decrease or end.
10. Ensure results of the equity pilot programs are widely shared to inform program and institutional dialogue around improving success, retention, and outcomes performance of African-American and Hispanic students.

Budget

Both the six-year and annual on-line formats for program review ask programs to identify current and future needs. Over time these fields will provide additional information and data to better support institutional planning. No matter which format has been used, a recurring theme noted by the committee, and included in the annual report each year, is the concern expressed by many programs that some level of support for maintaining current technology, infrastructure and facilities be included in the budget so that even in bad budget years a minimum level of maintenance can occur.

An instructional technology life cycle has been developed but, because of lack of state funding in the appropriate categories, in recent years programs have struggled while administrative and support units have had even fewer options for replacement. The committee is aware that Total Cost of Ownership documentation for facilities and technology documentation are being developed and when completed will provide more accurate information and projections to inform budgeting and institutional planning. However, to acknowledge the level of concern expressed by multiple programs, this item will continue to appear as a recommendation until the total cost of ownership documentation is completed.

11. Develop a plan for a more consistent baseline of funding for technology and infrastructure.