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(formerly known as Institutional Effectiveness Committee)

Annual Report 2018-2019

**IEC Evaluation of the 2018-2019 Process**

Overview:

In the transition from FY2017/2018 to FY2018/2019, the committee implemented the goals outlined in the previous annual report (18/19), going through all shared governance channels:

1. **The name of the committee** was changed from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to Planning and Integrated Program Review (PIPR). The name change emphasizes the planning and integration aspects of the self-study, as opposed to focusing on just the review aspect, as was the case in the past. The name change also reflects a change in the core purpose of program review, from looking back on past performance to looking ahead to future goals, and a close look at how those goals integrate with the college as a whole.

2. **The timeline** was overhauled. Instead of being reviewed once every six years or so, under the new model, each program is reviewed on a three-year cycle, and each cycle contains all the programs under one of three administrative umbrellas: Instructional Services, Student Services or Administrative Services. The new timeline, along with the reorganized rotation schedule, integrates program review more fully into the strategic planning cycle (and the accreditation calendar). Furthermore, it consolidates service areas and integrates them on the same calendar, the better to consult with one another as they plan. Lastly, it serves to cap a three-year cycle for each program, during which they spend two years implementing the goals of the previous cycle, and planning for the future simultaneously.

In the new model, much of the preliminary work for the self-study will be completed during the intervening two years between review cycles: the discussions of the larger issues facing the program, how it integrates into the other college planning committees, what resources they might need, etc. The self-study is completed in Year 1, during which programs outline the services offered, analyze their learning outcome assessment results, and set goals for the coming cycle. During Years 2 and 3, programs complete a program update, in which they review and documents the progress made on the set goals, emphasizing the ways those goals align with the college’s Strategic Plan, and also request necessary resources. These changes to the timeline bring the Program Review cycle into alignment with the Strategic Plan timeline, the Budget Committee timeline, and the Accreditation timeline.

3. **The list of principal participants** in Program Review grew to include a peer review component, and an oversight component. Instead of standing alone, as it has in the past, the self-study now sends its drafts to a peer review group (another program in the administrative area, related but separate from the program writing the self-study), and from a supervisor, getting suggestions for revision (and ultimately, a stamp of approval) at each checkpoint.

4. **The Self-Study forms** were completely redone. Irrelevant or peripheral questions were eliminated, redundant questions were consolidated, and new questions were added that focus on integration and planning. The new forms contain live links to the necessary resources and information, accessible not only to the authors of the self-study to anyone on campus at any time.

5. **A new set of handbooks** were published, one with instructions and best practices for completing the Self-Study, the other with instructions on how to access and interpret data from the GavData website.

6. **The website** was also completely redone. All links were updated, new links to the resources added and the page redesigned for ease of use.

7. **A series of work days and training sessions** was developed. The work days are designed to give the authors of the self-studies the chance to work on their drafts with committee members, including their support teams, present to answer questions. Peer review team members are also present at these work meetings, and other programs under the administrative area, thereby increasing opportunities for collaboration. The training sessions are designed to give participants more in-depth information on such topics as analyzing and interpreting data, setting goals, revising learning outcomes, and others. The training session topics are chosen based on feedback from the participants.

**8. An evaluation process** was developed to assess the effectiveness of the new changes. The Self-Study form now contains a built-in survey for participants to offer feedback on the new process, and suggestions for future updates. Additionally, the committee dedicated one meeting a year, in spring, to the evaluation process. All participants, in addition to being asked to contribute feedback in written form, are invited to the meeting to give the committee members their opinion of the process and their suggestions for the future.

9. **Funding** was secured for the upcoming Instructional Services cycle to allow for compensation for part-time faculty who are responsible for completing the Self-Study.

**Results**:

Administrative Services was the first area to undergo the new process. Despite the fact that it was the first go-round for this group, and many of the components of the new process were not yet in effect, the results are highly encouraging. Not only were all the reports submitted on time, but they were also largely of higher quality than before. The end-of-year meeting with program representatives, and the written survey comments, revealed that participants were more engaged in the process and found it more meaningful than before. Improved performance and attitude are largely due to two factors: 1) the expansion of participants to include peer review and oversight. Participants appreciated being able to collaborate with colleagues in real time, and being able to see the review process from a broader, more integrated perspective. 2) the shift in focus of the process, with the emphasis now being on planning for the future, and integration with the college’s larger goals. Participants expressed how the new focus allowed them to see how program review fits into the broader mechanisms of the college as a whole. The integration with the Budget Committee seems to be among the most impactful changes, as it resulted most effectively in illuminating the way Program Review now integrates with all the other functions on campus.

The committee received suggestions from the participants about potential revisions of the form, and about potential topics for future trainings, which will be implemented for the upcoming year’s cycle and/or the next Administrative Services cycle in two years.

**What’s Next:**

During the 2019-2020 cycle, Instructional Services will be completing their Self-Studies. This will be the first area to undergo the process with all the new components up and running. An orientation was conducted to discuss the new process with participants, and the work days and training sessions are scheduled for the next month.

As the cycle unfolds, the committee will be keeping in close contact with all participants, collecting questions and suggestions, with the goal of continuing to make the process easier, more integrated and more meaningful to all involved.