



TO: Dr. Cheryl Marshall, President
Crafton Hills College

FROM: Planning & Program Review Committee

DATE: April 25, 2016

SUBJECT: Planning and Program Review 2015-16; Summary of Program Health and Effectiveness

Fifteen programs were scheduled to complete the program review cycle during the 2015-2016 academic year. Because the PPR cycle occurred during what the college has come to call “the Churn,” the committee decided to allow programs to choose to move their full program reviews to next year’s agenda. Of the fifteen programs, nine were reviewed, and six were moved to next year’s agenda. The programs reviewed on-cycle included: the Child Development Center, Philosophy and Religious Studies, Physics/Astronomy, Student Success and Support, the Emergency Training Center, Marketing and Public Information, Facilities, English/Reading, and Fire Technology.

The programs that will be included on next year’s assessment agenda include: Administrative Services (CBO, communications, facilities), cafeteria, biology, financial aid, microbiology, and economics.

The committee reviewed all documents submitted, met with representatives, and provided written feedback to each unit. In addition, the annual plan of the program that did not meet rubric standards on a significant number of specific areas in last year’s full program review was examined and their plan does not need to be reviewed by the PPRC next year. This summary is provided as an overview of program health and effectiveness for your consideration. Using group consensus as a decision-making model and the rubrics published in the PPR Handbook as an evaluative guide, the committee assessed each unit on program effectiveness or health. The attached tables provide a summary of each program’s health.

[Program Review Results and Recommendations](#)

Based on the Committee’s assessment of the program reviews, five categories were identified and programs placed within each.



These programs showed **outstanding progress** on measures of program health and effectiveness, and also provided outstanding program review documents.

- Child Development Center

These programs meet or exceed rubric standards on all variables and submitted **exceptionally strong program** review documents.

- English/Reading
- Student Success and Support Program
- Philosophy/Religious Studies
- Fire Technology
- Marketing, Public Information
- Facilities

Healthy with Specific Needs. These programs are **healthy but require management guidance** in specific areas.

- Physics/Astronomy

Further Evaluation Recommended. Programs submitted documents that did not meet rubric standards on a significant number of measures and/or the documents were such that the committee could not fairly evaluate the units. Senior Management will assist these units in addressing specific concerns by identifying the steps needed for improvement.

- Emergency Training

Failure to Participate. Programs that did not participate are required to complete a program review in the following year and are not eligible to for any additional funding (e.g.: grants, etc.). The one program that did not complete a program review will be asked to submit a program review in Fall, 2015 and will be evaluated during the 2015-2016 cycle.

- Biology

Removed from the Need for PPRC to Review Annual Plan. The committee completed a review of the planning documents submitted by the two programs identified as needing to be reviewed by the PPRC in last year's Program Review cycle. The following units have been removed from the need to be reviewed by the PPRC next year.

- None

Continued on Status to be reviewed by PPRC Next Year. The annual plans for the following program need to be reviewed next year, and will require intervention by senior-level management.

- None



Committee Feedback to Units

Below is a synopsis of the feedback provided to each instructional and non-instructional unit that participated in Program Review during the 2015-2016 Program Review cycle.

Instructional Programs

Child Development Center. The unit submitted a thorough, well-written document. The unit provides a pattern of service that allows for good productivity and meets community needs, although a very small percentage of CHC students place their children in the center. The department also engages in the consistent use of data to inform program improvement. The revision of the state parent survey to provide the department with more meaningful information is a case in point, though the benchmark for this assessment or the original survey has not yet been attained. Goals were appropriately broad and strategic, though the committee wishes they were a bit more ambitious, and objectives were specific and measurable.

English and Reading. The department submitted a thorough, well-written document. Strengths were noted in the areas of student learning outcomes, course completion, course success, and fill rate, all of which are above the college averages. The department's only goal, to promote student success, is appropriately broad and ambitious. However, the objectives chosen to carry out the goal are primarily resources, not concrete, measurable, and attainable actions. The area requiring the most attention is the department's productivity target. Although the department has a much lower cap than many other programs, the productivity target appears to be the same as the college ratio. The committee recommends that the English/Reading faculty meet with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning to discuss an appropriate productivity target for the department.

Fire Technology. The unit submitted a document that was well-written and thorough providing to committee members a clear understanding of the Fire Technology program. The unit's goals and objectives are tied closely to the unit's self-evaluation and draw a clear connection to where the unit sees itself going over the next four years. The unit has made excellent progress in assessing student learning outcomes, and it appears the unit will complete the assessment cycle ("close the loop") over the next year as it reports how assessment results are being used to inform instruction. Lastly, the unit should focus some resources on considering how to best improve its course fill rate and WSCH/FTEF ratio.

Philosophy and Religious Studies. The unit submitted a thorough and well-written document. Curriculum is up-to-date and a new AAT has been recently approved. The unit's goals and objectives are closely aligned, addressing issues and concerns cited in the narrative of the document. Course completion is high, and progress has been made toward the course success target. The department needs to determine a productivity goal and ensure that the pattern of course offerings will allow it to be met. The committee urges the faculty to develop a plan to



complete SLO cycles in courses taught by adjunct instructors, and to develop a pattern of course offerings that maximizes productivity while maintaining the quality of the program.

Physics and Astronomy. The department submitted a document that was generally well-written and thorough, with the exception of a few non-rubric items. The department has done an excellent job of assessing student learning outcomes, and is using the information for program improvement. While the course completion and success data was provided to the committee, the department did not select a benchmark, nor was there a discussion about the reasons the completion and success rates lag behind those of the college. Last, the department's goals were, technically objectives, while some of the objectives were resource requests. A clearer understanding of the planning process would have made the department's plan a more useful guideline for the next three plus years.

Non-Instructional Programs

Emergency Training Center. While the document submitted provided some background information regarding the Emergency Training Center, some of the response items were not addressed. For example, the program did not provide qualitative or quantitative evidence that the ETC meets client needs. In addition, while the program has assessed some learning outcomes, no benchmarks have been chosen to ensure continuous program improvement. Last, there does not appear to be any alignment between the program's mission and that of the college. However, the program's goals are appropriately ambitious and the objectives are concrete and measurable, even though they do not align with the college's mission. The Committee will review the program's 2016-17 plan to determine whether any of these concerns have been addressed.

Facilities. The department submitted a though, well-written document that addressed most of the evaluation items. The Facilities department has a strong understanding of the issues related to the pattern of service, and has analyzed quantitative and qualitative information to determine its efficacy. The department's outcomes and program effectiveness measures include a facilities survey, a work management system, and the online facilities use report, as well as the staffing report. However, the department has not yet selected benchmarks for these measures, which limits the extent to which it can measure its progress toward service improvement (4.b). The document mentioned only one innovation (mentorship) and no partnerships in the document (5.a.i and 5.a.ii). The goals and objectives for the department were appropriate, and they align well with the issues and concerns outlined in the document. The committee would like to encourage the department to dream a bit more, and to consider developing some more ambitious goals, and to select *measurable* objectives. It is important to note that the department received a commendation from the accrediting commission in the 2014 external evaluation. A more thorough discussion of some of the PPR items would better demonstrate the high quality of services and support the Facilities department provides to the campus.



Marketing and Public Information. The unit submitted a thorough, well-written document. The unit provides a plethora of qualitative and quantitative data on which to assess service area outcomes and program effectiveness measures. The use of click-through rates to determine the effectiveness of various marketing techniques is a case in point, though service area outcomes statements should be defined and assessed and criteria for outreach and exposure effort should be established. Goals and objectives were appropriately strategic and reflected the overall self-evaluation of the unit, though the committee would like the unit to more thoroughly discuss in what ways the unit's mission and vision align with the college's mission and vision.

Student Success and Support Program. The department is commended for a thorough and well-written document, and for providing a clear explication of the SSSP program. The department will benefit from the completion of at least one cycle of student learning outcomes assessment. Assessment of the new components of the program is incomplete due to the newness of the program. The program has additional program effectiveness measures, however, and benchmarks have been selected for each of them. The committee suggests the department consider setting the benchmark for each effectiveness measure at least slightly lower than 100% to ensure the target is achievable. The department provided a thorough discussion of the program's alignment with the CHC mission, albeit not the current one. Goals are sufficiently ambitious, and objectives are concrete and measurable.