The Academic Senate initiated a Program Review Task Force to review 2010 Program Reviews and report to the Academic Senate and College Council. College Council asked the task force to identify needs within Program Reviews, but rather than provide lists of needs, College Council asked for common themes that would inform Institutional Planning and Budgeting. The task force identified the following five college wide themes: Articulation, Professional Development, Equipment & Technology, Staffing support and Strategic Marketing.
Program Review 2011

A Thematic Content Analysis

Introduction

The Fall 2011 Program Review Committee is presenting an annual report that continues to build upon West Valley College’s systematic processes (Appendix 1). This report serves to inform planning, resource allocation and decision making. It is presented to the Academic Senate and to College Council and is shared broadly for college-wide dialog.

The report is organized along several components:

1. Themes identified through content analysis

2. Themes evidenced in budget requests by program owners

3. Potential changes to demonstrate “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement” as required by ACCJC

4. Program Review 2012-2013 Planning Chart (Appendix 2)
The Program Review Committee noted an inspiring pride throughout the program reviews, with participants raving about the uniqueness and critical roles of their programs and the quality of the services they offer, while handling many initiatives. We are honored to serve in this capacity and humbled in the attempt to summarize this amazing institution into merely a few themes.

The Themes

In May 2011, the Academic Senate sent out a college-wide call to recruit anyone interested in an effort to form a Program Review Task Force charged to generate summaries and identify recurring themes of needs in program reviews. The members of the joint Program Review Committee and Program Review Task Force were tasked with reviewing sets of Instructional and Non-Instructional Program Reviews and related data summaries. For the first step in determining common themes from the Program reviews, committee members were asked to read their assigned reviews and list, by program, the stated specific needs, requests and any latent needs.

The second step involved small groups of committee members discussing the needs that emerged from their individual readings. The small groups reported out the common needs they discovered. Members also discussed other possible needs that might have crossed over the groups.

The third step involved the joint committee members determining the themes that were most prevalent across all program reviews. Evidence of many of the themes appeared in instructional, non-instructional, and administrative unit program reviews.

The five themes, in alphabetical order, with examples:

- **Articulation**
  - Architecture — develop articulation with new institutions
  - DM/IS — articulation development
  - Art — expand SJSU articulation for animation

- **Equipment and Technology**
  - Architecture — software/interactive technology
  - DM/IS — publishing tools, software, technology to enhance student retention
  - Photography — new computerized lab to replace traditional darkroom
  - Chemistry — software, computer technology, and replacement of failing GC equipment
  - Psychology — new laboratory system
  - Geography — new automated weather station and Smart Classroom
  - Health Care Technologies -- funding for disposable medical supplies
  - Economics -- learning tools such as video clips and assessment & evaluation tools
  - Theater Arts -- LED lights in the Theater
  - Webmaster -- Web Content Management System

- **Professional Development**
  - DM/IS — instructor training to maintain currency and update curriculum
  - English — Distance Learning training and other technology training
Themes and Budget Requests

Committee members sought to determine the connectivity between the Program Review process and the budget. Each budget request was categorized by theme. The committee also considered the budget requests for themes that were not in the content of the program review. Because there were no additional themes identified when considering just the budget, this comparative process evidences the linkage between the program reviews and budget requests.

The Program Review Committee noted a gap between the program reviews and the budgeting request process. There were multiple examples of program owners listing needs within the program reviews, but not identifying these needs in the budget request process. Conversely, some needs were identified within the budget, but not discussed within the content of the program. The Program Review Committee considers this a process gap, rather than a program issue.

In addition, there are many needs identified in the budget that did not fall into any of the themes identified in the content of the program review. These “No Theme Alignment” requests were in most cases normal and ongoing cost of education. This most often showed up in terms of paper, chemicals, sports travel costs, leases, warranty / service contracts etc. The Program Review Committee considered this outside the scope of its review.
This chart identifies the percentage of budget requests that align with the themes.

This second chart uses the same budget request and themes as above, but is based on dollars.
Continuous Quality Improvement

To meet the ACCJC Standard of Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, the West Valley College Program Review process must:

- Continuously and systematically assess and improve student learning and achievement
- Improve institutional effectiveness
- Improve program practices that result in improvement in student achievement and learning

The Program Review Committee believes that there are a number of improvements that can be made to the process and that the Program Review Committee has an on-going role in designing and implementing those improvements. However, as a sub-committee of the Academic Senate, any substantive change to the Program Review Process will need to be approved by the Senate prior to implementation.

In addition to shared governance consultation, the Program Review Committee will seek best practices by investigating processes from other colleges. The Program Review Committee will principally be informed by The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Program Review: Setting the Standard (2009), and the ACCJC: Elements of an Effective Program Review for Integrated Planning, Learning Outcomes and Assessment.

Validation and Improved Accountability

Through the current process, program owners are able address many issues regarding their programs that include their needs, goals, and pedagogical assumptions that drive curriculum develop or produce program modification. It is the intent of the Program Review Committee to continue to monitor these aspects.

The Program Review Committee realizes that in order for college programs to demonstrate “sustainable continuous quality improvement,” the Program Review Questionnaire must ask questions that will prompt quality improvement dialogue within programs, thus resulting in opportunity for those programs to report specific quality improvement(s).

The Program Review Committee will not participate in Program Discontinuance. However, the Academic Senate clarified the responsibility to capture and track program improvement information within the Program Review Process, by stating within the Program Discontinuance Policy that, “It is the intent of this policy that no program should be discontinued unless the program has had an adequate opportunity to improve its performance as delineated in its Program Review” (WVCAS Policy and Process for Program Discontinuance Adopted April 19, 201, pg. 3).
Quantitative Program Data Analysis

It is important that program owners view data which not only benchmarks their program to the college as is done now, but also to its peer program across the state. The Program Review Committee will work with Performance Goals Committee, Division Chair Council or other entities to ensure that program owners are reviewing the relevant data to allow for vision, planning and continuous program improvement.

Further to that end, continuous improvement is intentional. It is achieved through the management and reporting of goals, targets, commitments and resource allocation. Improvements must then be tested or implemented to determine if they work, and the results need to then be reported. A revised Program Review Questionnaire will provide prompts to collect this information.

Qualitative Program Data Analysis

It is imperative to note that there is richness to many programs that cannot be measured through quantitative measures alone. The Program Review Committee values a mixed methods approach that will prompt program owners to report qualitative data that reveals pedagogical philosophies, and the development of the whole student.

Continuous Improvement of Reviews

The Program Review Committee will work to develop improved consistency and quality within Program Reviews. Such improvement will involve an evaluation of all program reviews against a rubric. The program will then receive timely feedback identifying areas of strength and opportunities to improve.

It is important to note that the Program Review Committee cannot reject program reviews. However, the committee can provide feedback that will help guide program owners if there is a need for the program to improve the quality of its review.

Changing the Program Review Cycle

The Program Review Committee proposes changing the Program Review Process to an every other year cycle with an alternate scaled-down review. This alternate year review will provide updates regarding improvements stated in the previous year review.

Policies, Procedures and Reporting Program Review

Currently, there is no policy that governs Program Review. The Program Review Committee will document a Program Review Policy that aligns with the West Valley College Mission Statement. A draft Policy will be available for review by Academic Senate by the end of February 2012.
Final Thought

The guiding vision for an effective Program Review is best summarized by the State Academic Senate, “Program review could be one of the most powerful and effective tools to shape and reshape a college. When it is linked to budgeting, planning, and other processes to carry out its recommendations, program review can contribute to fair and transparent institutional processes. The program review self-study allows for the people with the greatest level of expertise in a particular program to examine and scrutinize the program for effectiveness in serving students and achieving educational excellence” (The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Program Review: Setting the Standard, 2009).
## Appendix 1

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review  
(Sample institutional behaviors) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Awareness**             | • There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.  
• There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.  
• There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.  
• The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units. |
| **Development**           | • Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.  
• Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.  
• Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.)  
• Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.  
• Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.  
• Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation. |
| **Proficiency**           | • Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.  
• Results of all program review are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.  
• The program review framework is established and implemented.  
• Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.  
• Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.  
• The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. |
| **Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement** | • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.  
• The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.  
• The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning. |
Appendix 2
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