
**Allan Hancock Joint Community College District
Board Policy
Chapter 3 – General Institution**

BP 3255 PROGRAM REVIEW

The primary purpose of program review is to determine program effectiveness; its processes are designed to recognize good performance and to identify and assist programs needing improvement. Program review also drives the institution's annual planning and resource allocation processes. All educational programs, student support services, and administrative departments of Allan Hancock College will be reviewed at least once every six years in accordance with the procedures. Based on findings and recommendations, such reviews may result in expansion or modification of programs, services, or departments, or a recommendation of further review to assess vitality and feasibility. Board Policy 4021 addresses the process to assess instructional and student services programs recommended for vitality review.

The superintendent/president may initiate an additional program review based on the needs of the district.

References:

Educational Programs:

Education Code Section 78016

Title 5 Section 51022

Title 5 Section 53200

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges Western

Association of Schools and Colleges - Standard 2

Student Services Programs:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Standard 2

Administrative Programs:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Standard 3

Revised: 3/17/98
Revised: 1/25/00
Revised: 6/18/13
Revised: 8/11/15

Revised: 3/11/04
Revised: 12/16/08
Reviewed: 1/16/24

(Replaces Board Policy 7930)

Allan Hancock Joint Community College
District Administrative Procedure
Chapter 3 – General Institution

AP 3255 PROGRAM REVIEW

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW

ALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

1. All programs are required to participate in program review every academic year. Each year programs will answer annual prompts and prompts for one of the five core topics of the programs choosing. A core topic will be addressed each year leaving the sixth year to catch-up or update core topics from previous years. At the beginning of each academic year, program deans will provide the Office of the Chief Instructional Officer the name of the faculty member responsible and the core topic chosen for that year. The five core topics programs can choose from are:
 - Innovative Scheduling
 - Curriculum and Teaching Design
 - Education and Industry Partnerships
 - Enrollment Trends and Efficiency
 - Academic Services and Support

All core topics must be addressed by the end of the six-year cycle.

2. The Academic Senate has primary responsibility for creating and revising processes for reviewing educational programs and services.

All full-time instructors in the program are encouraged to participate in program planning. The program report will, whenever possible, reflect the opinions of all discipline instructors. Associate faculty and CSEA members are encouraged to participate. Collaboration is encouraged among faculty in related disciplines and stakeholders.

The program planning team will use program data pertaining to the core topic they have chosen and evaluation criteria as a basis for preparing and writing the program planning report. The annual prompt questions include a follow-up of the core topic chosen for the previous academic year, learning outcomes assessment,

2-year program maps, staffing changes, and program successes. Core topic prompts address challenges, plans for innovation metrics, and resources needed.

3. The program planning report is submitted to the appropriate academic dean two weeks prior to the end of the academic year for review. A copy is submitted to the Chief Instructional Officer by the end of the spring semester.
4. Validation occurs within the 6-year cycle, typically in the sixth year. The program selects the members of the validation team that may include any combination of the following: Faculty in the same or related discipline
 - Dean
 - A representative from a 4-year institution in the same or related discipline
 - A representative from another community college in the same or related discipline
 - A representative from the local high schools in the same or related discipline
 - A member of the advisory committee
 - A currently established group like success team

Typically, a validation team includes faculty from the discipline and parallel disciplines and the appropriate dean or a previously established group like the student success team.

5. The validation team is comprised of the dean of the area, one faculty member from a related discipline/program, and two faculty members from unrelated disciplines. At the option of the self-study team, the validation team may also include one or more of the following:
 - a. someone from a four-year institution in the same discipline.
 - b. someone from another community college in the same discipline.
 - c. a high school instructor in the same discipline.
 - d. member of an advisory committee for the program.
6. The validation team prepares a cover report following its review of the self-study including observations and recommendations. This report is completed within one month of receipt of the self-study and is made available to the self-study team, who reviews it for accuracy of information. Recommendations may include the following:
 - a. continue the program as presently offered.
 - b. Modify the program in specific ways
 - c. Review the program for vitality and feasibility under Board Policy 4021.
7. For vocational programs the annual update replaces the two-year program and addresses, in addition to the other components, whether the program:

- a. meets a documented labor market demand.
 - b. does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.
 - c. is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.
8. Upon completion (two weeks prior to the end of the spring semester), the program review is forwarded to the dean and department to be used for unit- and district-level planning and budgeting. The dean forwards one copy of the completed report to the Chief Instructional Officer. An electronic copy is sent to Institutional Effectiveness for archiving.
9. If the program review recommends a vitality review, the processes and procedures in Board Policy 4021 will be followed.

Adopted: 3/11/04
Revised: 12/16/08
Revised: 5/21/13
Revised: 7/14/15
Revised: 12/19/23

STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW

1. All student service programs are required to participate in program review every academic year. Each year programs will answer annual prompts and prompts for one of the five core topics of the programs choosing. A core topic will be addressed each year leaving the sixth year to catch-up or update core topics from previous years. At the beginning of each academic year, the appropriate program dean or supervisor will provide the Chief Student Services Officer the name of the person responsible and the core topic chosen for that year. The five core topics programs can choose from are:
 - Innovative Scheduling
 - Curriculum and Teaching Design
 - Education and Industry Partnerships
 - Enrollment Trends and Efficiency
 - Academic Services and Support
2. The Academic Senate has primary responsibility for creating and revising processes for reviewing educational programs and services.
3. The team is chaired by a full-time faculty person in the discipline area whenever possible and who has primary responsibility for writing the self-study. If not possible, the team is chaired by the program dean or director. The team consists of at least one full-time faculty member from within the program, if applicable; one representative from within that student services area, and an additional student services representative from another student services area. Every effort will be made to include a CSEA member on each team. Part-time faculty and a student are encouraged to participate. Additional members from within the program may serve as resources to the Program Planning Team as their work assignment pertains to the program review development.
4. The program planning team will use program data pertaining to the core topic they have chosen and evaluation criteria as a basis for preparing and writing the program planning report. The annual prompt questions include a follow-up on the core topic chosen for the previous academic year, learning outcomes assessment, 2-year program maps, staffing changes, and program successes. Core topic prompts address challenges, plans for innovation, metrics, and resources needed.
5. The program planning report is made available to a validation team before the end of the semester in which the study was initiated.
6. The Chief Student Services Officer appoints the chair of the validation team. The chair will be a dean, director, or coordinator from another student service area. The remaining members of the validation team include one faculty member (from outside of student services) and one other student service representative. Optional members of the validation team may also include one or more of the following:

- a. someone from a four-year institution in the same service area;
 - b. someone from another community college in the same service area;
 - c. a high school representative
7. Written notification of the proposed composition of the validation team is forwarded to the Chief Student Services Officer for approval. The validation team prepares a cover report following its review of the self-study including observations and recommendations. The report is completed within one month of receipt of the self-study and is made available to the self-study team, who reviews it for accuracy of information. Recommendations may include the following:
- a. continue the program as presently offered.
 - b. Review or modify the program in specific ways.
 - c. review the program for vitality and feasibility under Board Policy 4021
8. The validation team chair forwards one copy of the self-study recommendations and the final validation report to the Chief Student Services Officer.
9. Upon completion (by the end of the second week of April), the program review or annual update is forwarded to the appropriate dean or supervising administrator and department to be used for unit- and district-level planning and budgeting. The administrator forwards one copy of the completed report to the Chief Student Services Officer. An electronic copy will be sent to Institutional Effectiveness for archiving.
10. If the program review recommends a vitality review, the processes and procedures in Board Policy 4021 will be followed.

Adopted: 3/11/04
Revised: 5/21/13
Revised: 7/14/15
Revised: 12/19/23

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM REVIEW

1. The superintendent/president will establish the schedule for review of programs.
2. Administrative programs are identified as:
 - Academic Affairs
 - Auxiliary Accounting Services
 - Business Services
 - Campus Graphics
 - Campus Police
 - College Advancement
 - Finance and Administration (VP office)
 - Human Resources
 - Information Technology Services
 - Institutional Effectiveness
 - Institutional Grants
 - Operations (VP office)
 - PCPA Auxiliaries
 - Plant Services
 - President's Office
 - Public Affairs and Communications
 - Student Services (VP office)
3. Under a cabinet level administrator oversight, each administrative department manager shall develop a program review document based on data and evidence to assess and improve performance on established functions and Service Area Outcomes (SAO). The SOAs are measures of department function effectiveness. For example,
 - if the function is payroll, an effective SAO would be to process payroll on time with 99 percent accuracy.
 - If the function is Plant Services repairs, an effective SAO would be to complete all work orders in a timely manner.
 - If the function is grant applications, an effective SAO would be to file X number of grant applications and complete the application process on time.

The program review includes an Action Plan. Planning and budget processes will be based on program review.

4. The manager responsible for the program review will establish a 3-4 member committee that includes members of the department and at least one external team member approved by the superintendent/president or cabinet level administrator.

- a. The external member will provide validation to the program review by preparing a memo including the following:

Structural review: Does the report include the program scope, surveys or other data related to outcomes assessment, quantitative and qualitative data related to operations, findings and an action plan?

- Observations: Does the external team member find the information in the program review valid and accurate? Is there any important information missing?
- Commendations: Are there any areas in which the program deserves a commendation for performance excellence?
- Findings/Action Plan: Are the findings accurate and related to the SAO assessment? Does the action plan address improvements based on SAO assessment? Is the action plan reasonable and attainable within one program review cycle?

The external validation memo will be made available to the entire program review team, and included as an attachment to the program review when it is submitted to the appropriate cabinet member and the Institutional Effectiveness Office.

5. The written program review will include the following components:

- a. **Scope** A description of the current scope of services including the specific functions performed by the department and who it serves.
 - b. **Survey** Data and analysis of performance on stated functions and Service Area Outcomes to include the following steps:
 - A survey instrument developed in collaboration with the office of Institutional Research and Planning appropriate to evaluating the performance of the department functions and Service Area Outcomes.
 - The survey will be distributed college-wide by the office of Institutional Effectiveness.
 - A compilation and analysis of survey results to measure the degree of effectiveness to which Service Area Outcomes are being achieved.
 - c. **Current demand for services** Quantitative and qualitative data based on survey results, constituent feedback, evolving organizational needs, changes in technology, etc.
 - d. **Findings** Recommendations to improve department performance in its functions and Service Area Outcomes:

- Plans for expansion and improvement
 - Facility needs
 - Technology needs
 - Current and future staffing requirements
- e. **Action Plan** An Action Plan that details activities, responsibilities, timelines, measures of effectiveness and funding needs, if applicable. The plan provides for continuous improvement in Service Area Outcomes and links to the district's strategic plan.
6. The manager responsible for the program under review will coordinate the process and complete the written report in collaboration with the program review committee. The written report will be submitted to the appropriate cabinet member.
7. After approval by the appropriate cabinet member, the program review and annual update will be used for the unit and district level planning and budgeting. Send the completed program review electronically to Institutional Effectiveness for archiving.
8. A program review shall be conducted by each department in a six-year cycle. Departments will annually review their program review and update their action plans.

Adopted: 3/11/04
Revised: 12/16/08
Revised: 6/19/12
Revised: 12/19/23

Approved: 1/16/85
Revised: 3/17/98
Revised: 1/25/00
Revised: 1/11/01
Revised: 3/11/04

Revised: 12/16/08
Revised: 6/18/13
Revised: 7/14/15
Revised: 12/19/23

(Replaces Administrative Procedures 7930.01, 7930.02, 7930.03)