

*Santa Monica College*  
**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 collect and analyze effectiveness data, and assists administrative programs to develop 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.

Comprehensive program review reports are submitted to the Academic Senate Joint Program Review Committee and thoroughly reviewed every six years; 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. In an attempt to further strengthen the broader institutional view afforded through the program review process, during its annual review of the process and six-year rotation schedule, the committee decided to pair certain programs under a broader heading with the thought that this would allow a broader view to 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 collecting 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 program review.

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 guides and frequently asked questions documents available on the Program Review website as well as explanations for each prompt accessible by clicking on the help button in each prompt field in CurricUNET. In this CurricUNET and annual report inaugural year, programs had the option to submit reports using CurricUNET or in an electronic Word format. As this was a beta 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 meet individually with programs when requested.

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 all-programs 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, DSPS  
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 anything that may have been or are in the process of being addressed since committee review of the 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)