

Program Integrated Planning and Review (PIPR) Committee

Annual Report 2019-2020

PIPR Evaluation of the 2019-2020 Process

Overview:

In the transition from AY2018/2019 to AY2019/2020, the committee implemented the rest of 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 Program Integrated Planning and 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 an oversight component. Instead of standing alone, as it has in the past, the self-study is now routed to supervisors (in this case, Deans), who signed off before the report came to the committee. For the next cycle, the committee is looking into including a formal peer-review component, wherein a person from a separate but related program offers feedback on the study.

4. **The Self-Study forms** were revised. 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. The trainings took place during the last half of the regularly scheduled Department Chair meetings.

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.

10. **Merge with the Budget Committee:** This was a new goal for 2019-2020. The PIPR Committee and the Budget (Resources Allocation Committee) began the process of a formal merger, with new by-laws and combined membership. This merger combines the membership of both committees into one, with each member taking on the responsibilities of both committees. As of the writing of this report, the merger is mostly complete. The by-laws were approved in March, and the committee is currently looking at Board Policies and Administrative Procedures relevant to the committee's mission.

11. **Closing the Loop:** Also new this year was the final response of the committee to each program representative, thanking them for their participation, informing them of the status of their budget requests, and offering feedback on their self-study form.

Results:

This year, Instructional Programs submitted their self-studies. This includes all academic disciplines as well as support services directly tied to Academic Affairs. Almost 90% of the reports were submitted by the deadline, and the majority of those were of good or excellent quality. 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 inclusion of the group work days. 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 Resource Allocation Process (RAP) Committee, aka 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. This change was made evident in the new Resource Allocation Process. We created a rubric with which to rank each budget request, based on the integration of the stated goal with the College's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan, and on the SMART quality of the goal (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely) Once the requests were ranked, the committee chose a cut-off point between those requests recommended for funding and those not recommended. Then a letter was sent to the program representatives informing them of the status of their requests, as well as offering feedback on the quality of their self-study submissions. This last item was something that had been lacking in Program Review to this point, with programs often having no idea whether their request for funding had been granted, let alone the process for deciding that outcome.

Due to the transmission of all classes and meetings to an online format in the spring, the committee's final meetings, including the meeting soliciting feedback from program reps about the new process, were conducted via Zoom. PIPR received suggestions from the participants about potential revisions of the form, and about potential topics for future trainings, which will be implemented for the next cycle.

What's Next:

PIPR/RAP will have a half-day retreat in August to prepare for the 2020-21 Academic Year. At this retreat, we will conduct some training for committee members and finalize the merger between PIPR and the Resource Allocation Process.

During the 2020-2021 cycle, Student Services will be completing their Self-Studies. An orientation is scheduled for May 18 to discuss the new process with participants, and the work days and training sessions are scheduled for the next month.

Final Note:

During our visit this year with , the members of that body made a special effort to point out how impressed they were with the progress made by PIPR in the last two years. They declared that we are a model for how program review should be conducted, and urged us to make a presentation to the State Academic Senate Plenary Session in April detailing the changes we made and the results. And we would have too, if it hadn't been for that meddling coronavirus quarantine.