

PROGRAM REVIEW WRITING: DEPARTMENT LEVEL WORK

What's due: Department program review

Deadline: 12/13/13

Submit review template work to: Kent and Cecile

Please use the following table to fill in your department's information so that it can be input into TaskStream by Matt Jordan's department.

Included in this document:

TaskStream Table to fill in.

Example of the findings section for Category III, component A.

Rubric for TaskStream input.

Kent will schedule another meeting soon so we can all check in.

The next major step after collecting your actionable data is to begin writing up the review. The review must be written within a specific framework that will fit into TaskStream, the portal system within which PCC programs and their supporting departments enter the reports of their assessment cycles.

Below is a list of the requirements for each review. It is the department level program review that will provide information for the five broader program level reviews: Enrollment, Student Support Services, Learning Assistance, Engagement, and Exiting. So, each department will address the structure below in their reviews. You can use this form to write in your department's information.

Rubric (standards grid) is attached

The rubric for the reviews is attached. The mission statement and outcome rubric will be familiar to many of you from summer workshops.

SLS Program Review Required Elements

Standing Requirements	
Introduction	The counseling department works collaboratively with campus partners to provide support for students' lifelong learning, personal, academic, and career goals. A variety of services are offered through the counseling department to reach students including one on one 30 minute appointments, online counseling, and express counseling. We work with students to explore goals, majors, and careers and develop educational plans. We also provide a new student orientation which was revised and implemented the spring fall 2013 term.

Organizational Chart	<pre> graph TD Dean["Dr. Cynthia Olivo Dean, Student and Learning Services"] Dean --- Branch1 Dean --- Branch2 Dean --- Branch3 subgraph Branch1 [Front Office Staff] B1_1["Rosalie Belliti Rosa Villegas Nancy Martinez Anh Ha Rosie Roberson"] end subgraph Branch2 [General Counselors] B2_1["Myriam Altounji James Aragon Harry Bloodgood Amy Cheung Patricia D'Orange-Martin Cecile Davis Anderson Armando Duran Janis Dwyer Hillina Jarso Elizabeth Kaiama Gena Lopez Edward Martinez Cecilia Medina Sara Miranda Ana Ogaz Tomás Riojas Lan Truong"] end subgraph Branch3 [Service Areas] B3_1["Michael McClellan Athletes"] B3_2["Katherine Swain Maria Becerra Career Counseling"] B3_3["Lynell Wiggins CTE"] B3_4["Bianca Richards DSP&S"] B3_5["Regenia Cooper EOP&S/CARE Programs"] B3_6["Evangelina Quintanar Nursing Retention(Grant Funded)"] B3_1 --- B3_2 --- B3_3 --- B3_4 --- B3_5 --- B3_6 end </pre>
Mission Statement	<p>The mission of the Counseling Department is to support the college's mission by facilitating the attainment of lifelong learning skills advancing our students' personal, academic, and career goals to completion. We promote the self-awareness and self-reliance necessary for success.</p>
Program Outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A student will make informed educational decisions to achieve his or her goals. 2. A student will identify and utilize resources that will assist in achieving his or her goals. 3. A student will feel personally acknowledged, valued, connected and more aware of his or her potential to achieve personal goals.

Counseling Department Review

Recommendations Update	<p>Optional</p>
-------------------------------	-----------------

Category I. Function

Component A: Services Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select functions that support the college mission, the program mission and the EMP. These functions come from the services that support your outcomes.
---------------------------------------	--

--	--

Category II. Institutional Support

Component A: Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of full-time and part-time staff meets program needs • College resources are effectively allocated to meet program needs (equipment, technology, supplies, etc.) • To what extent does Full-time and part-time staff pursue necessary professional development and growth
Component B: Space Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The space needs of the program are met

Category III. Accountability

Component A: Internal Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of your department outcomes over the last six years • Internal constituent satisfaction is measured and the results are used for improvement. This is where actionable data from past and current surveys and other assessments of your outcomes is critical.
Component B: External Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For those departments held to external measures. Provide data on how you are meeting the requirements of your external stakeholders.

Measure Findings Template

To guide your work for completing the Category iii Accountability, Component A section that will go in TaskStream, the following document developed by Matt should be helpful. I've included below an example from Counseling **in red**.

Outcome:

Write the program outcome here. (Counseling assessed all department outcomes, but here I will just list one for the example.)

SLO #1: A student will be able to make informed educational decisions to achieve his or her goals.

SLO #2: A student will be able to identify and utilize resources that will assist in achieving his or her goals.

SLO #3: A student will be able to feel personally acknowledged, valued, connected and more aware of his or her potential to achieve personal goals.

Measure:

Write the name of your assessment here, for example "Client Satisfaction Survey."

"SurveyMonkey survey of Counseling Student Learning Outcomes."

Description of Measure (WHAT data were used to measure the outcome?):

Please describe the measure/assessment in detail. What were the components of the

measure/assessment? What was the process by which it was developed? Who administered it? Is the data valid and reliable?

A committee of counselors and the dean of SLS met over several weeks to craft a survey to measure the department SLOs. With the support of IPRO, the questions were refined and tagged for which outcome they assessed for. A survey evaluation is sent out to each student via email, following their individual counseling appointment. The evaluation is via Survey Monkey and includes a Likert scale, multiple choice and open ended response options.

Each counseling related survey statement is connected to an SLO. The average score for each statement is indicated at the end of the statement.

SLO #1: A student will be able to make informed educational decisions to achieve his or her goals.

Between 72% and 90% of students strongly agreed or agreed with positive statements related to SLO #1.

1. The counselor explained policies/procedures that helped me understand my options. (Examples: probation policy, withdrawal policy/procedure, academic renewal petition, graduation petition) (4.39)
2. I learned how to get an Associate Degree, complete transfer requirements or certificate requirements. (4.44)
3. With the help of the counselor, my goal is now clear. (Examples: Get a certificate, AA/AS degree or Transfer) (4.44)
4. I left the appointment knowing the next steps I need to take to achieve my goal. (4.58)
5. I am feeling more confident that I can make my own decisions after my counseling appointment. (4.45)

SLO #2: A student will be able to identify and utilize resources that will assist in achieving his or her goals.

Between 79% and 92% of students strongly agreed or agreed with positive statements related to SLO #2.

1. The counselor was familiar with college services and available to students. (4.51)
2. The counselor presented information in a clear and well-organized manner. (4.58)
3. I received information that I can use to reach my goal. (4.54)
4. Because of the counseling appointment, I know how to do research to reach my educational goal. (Career or major) (4.43)

SLO #3: A student will be able to feel personally acknowledged, valued, connected and more aware of his or her potential to achieve personal goals.

Between 77% and 93% of students strongly agreed or agreed with positive statements related to SLO #3.

1. The counselor showed interest in exploring options to achieve my goals. (4.53)
2. The counselor helped me with a personal or academic problem I am having. (4.51)
3. The counselor was encouraging. (4.44)
4. I left the counseling session feeling that most of my questions were answered within my 30 minute appointment. (4.46)
5. The counselor treated me fairly and with respect. (4.67)
6. I would recommend this counselor to other students. (4.55)

Acceptable Target and Rationale:

What would be an acceptable result of the assessment? What is your reasoning for choosing this acceptable result?

It was our hope that at least 75% of students responding demonstrated learning in the first two outcomes

and reported agreement with the third, more affective/satisfaction outcome. The rationale was that we aspired to more than a simple majority of positive responses.

Ideal Target and Rationale:

What would be an ideal result of the assessment? What is your reasoning for choosing this ideal result?

An ideal target would be at least 80%. Given our results are currently above 70% for all three outcomes, we are interested in continuously getting better at serving the students.

What steps were taken to analyze the data?:

Was the measure/assessment analyzed by an individual or a group? Who was involved?

Our lead, Hillina Jarso, in collaboration with IPRO staff, analyzed the meaning of the data. A report was then written, highlighting trends in the open-ended questions, and discussed during professional learning day in a department meeting prior to the fall 2013 semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel (WHO analyzed the data?):

Dr. Cynthia Olivo, Dean, Hillina Jarso and Crystal Kollross.

Supporting Attachments:

Survey results *ready to attach*

Reports *ready to attach*

Rubric used in the assessment *not used*

Copy of the results *ready to attach*

Minutes from meetings *ready to attach with photos of discuss notes from board*

Summary of Findings:

Interpret the data. What does it mean?

In response to statements regarding the clarity of the process to make an appointment and they were treated in a professional and friendly manner when scheduling that appointment, the average scores were 4.35 and 4.31, respectively. The results indicated that most students attempted 1-2 times to get an appointment, but we only received responses from the students who were committed enough to arrive early in the morning and wait in line in order to ensure they secured an appointment. Thus, we don't have data on the number of attempts made by students who were unsuccessful in scheduling an appointment in this survey.

Results:

Acceptable Target Achievement (select one of the following): Not Met, Met, Exceeded;

Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement (select one of the following): Moving Away, Approaching, Exceeded

Approaching

Recommendations for Improvement:

Do the results demonstrate that the outcome was met? If not, how might performance in the outcome be improved? If there are multiple recommendations for improvement, what are the priorities? Some areas to consider for improvement:

- a. Process: Does the way that the service is delivered need to be examined or changed?*
- b. Organization: Reorganize staff assignments? Improve communications? Modify policies?*
- c. Collaboration: Work with faculty or staff in other campus units to improve the outcome.*
- c. Pedagogy: If the support service program has learning outcomes, then do the instructional methods need to be adjusted?*
- d. Staff member support: Professional development for staff. Make more use of technology or student assistants to allow staff to focus more on professional-level tasks.*
- e. Revision of SSOs*
- f. Equipment/supplies/space*

We will use the results as a tool for staff development and discussion to assist in further improving our services. Specifically focus on areas in which we scored lower in the “strongly/agree” areas. The outcome that scored slightly lower than the others was SLO #1. Specifically, the statements addressing the following: Assisting students with personal/academic problems, learning how to get an associate degree/complete transfer and explaining policies and procedures. However, it is important to note that the results were still positive and not all students are experiencing a “problem” or in need of specific policy explanation.

A team of counselors have revised the counseling department appointment process and are currently conducting trainings and evaluations of the process in its pilot phase.

Additional Recommendations for Improvement:

- Consistently revisit our scheduling process and adding counselors/counseling appointments.
- Address customer service with front desk staff.
- Significantly increase the number of survey responses, given the number of students that are seen. Counselors should begin informing students of the survey they will receive and encouraging them to complete it.
- Identify incentives for students to complete the survey.
- Use the results as a tool for staff development and discussion to assist in further improving our services.
- Specifically focus on areas in which we scored lower in the “strongly/agree” areas. The outcome that scored slightly lower than the others was SLO #1. Specifically, the statements addressing the following: Assisting students with personal/academic problems, learning how to get an associate degree/complete transfer and explaining policies and procedures. However, it is important to note that the results were still positive and not all students are experiencing a “problem” or in need of specific policy explanation.
- Evaluate our express and online counseling components for future assessment reports.
- There is high demand for counseling services from our student body as evidenced by the lines and demand for appointments reported by our front office staff. Further evidence needs to be collected on the number of students who are turned away from counseling services due to the high volume of demand to evaluate the changes made to such

procedures.

- Facilities: Current setup for express/drop-in counseling is not meeting counseling needs for some level of privacy.

Reflections/Notes:

Were there any take-aways or realizations about the process that you had? How could the process, the assessment, the data, etc. be improved next time?

While we are pleased with the overall positive responses we received from the surveyed students, we know that there are some areas that require our attention. The next iteration of our survey needs to dig a bit deeper into other aspects of our services. For example, since our last survey, and in part as result of what we have learned, Express Counseling has been instituted for students who were not able to secure an appointment on the same day they sought to get one. We would like to evaluate this service. We would also like to evaluate our online counseling service and the process by which we are trying to maximize the number of students who apply for the associate degree.

A survey administered to students after a counseling appointment reveals that 21.4% of 435 students had to return 3-5 times in order to obtain counseling assistance. Students provided these comments in the free write section of the survey

We are rationing out scarce resources to students and we need more counselors. Community Colleges provide the most access to students from historically underrepresented groups, yet without the appropriate support and resources in place, research reveals that students will not succeed. Access without support is basically not access.

Although PCC is implementing technology that nearly every other community college in the state has—an electronic degree auditing system to provide immediate information about where a student is in terms of completing his or her goal, students will still need the support of a counselor to provide critical guidance in the form of social and cultural capital (Olivo, 2009, Mesa 2011).

The graduation petitioning process should also be evaluated looking at the effectiveness of the process and identifying any challenges students face while attempting to file for graduation petitions.

Rubric for Evaluation of SLS Program Reviews

Introduction
The Introduction should include an overview of your program, any highlights since the last program review, and innovations in the program and/or collaborations with other departments, units, or programs.
Recommendations Update
Status update on recommendations from previous program review
Organizational Chart
A diagram representing the structure of the program, showing the relationships of the staff to each other, and the hierarchy of management.

Mission Statement: Outlines the purpose of the program, identifies stakeholders, and aligns to the mission of the college and the Educational Master Plan (EMP).				
Criterion	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing	Missing
Purpose	Comprehensive; both broadly defines program and includes specific purpose.	Broadly defines program or includes specific purpose.	Too general to distinguish the program or too specific to encompass the entire program mission.	
Stakeholders	Student focused. Identifies primary and other stakeholders.	Identifies primary stakeholders.	Incorrectly identifies stakeholders.	
Mission & EMP Alignment	Aligned with college mission and specific EMP priorities.	Aligned with college mission and the EMP.	Not clearly aligned with college mission or EMP.	
External Alignment	Illustrates active engagement with respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations, if applicable.	Addresses alignment with respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations, if applicable.	Does not address alignment with respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations, if applicable.	

Program Outcomes: Concise statement which describe what a client will experience, receive or understand as a result of a given service.				
Criterion	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing	Missing
Focus	All outcome statements are stakeholder focused. Statements are written in terms understandable to all constituency groups.	The majority of outcome statements are stakeholder focused.	Fewer than half of the outcome statements are stakeholder focused.	
Measurability	All outcomes are defined using easily assessed higher level action verbs which require	The majority of outcomes are defined using easily assessed higher level action verbs which	Fewer than half of outcomes are defined using easily assessed higher level action verbs which	

	critical thinking skills i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy.	require critical thinking skills i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy.	require critical thinking skills i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy.	
Alignment	Aligned with program mission, and as appropriate aligned with respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations.	Aligned with program mission, and as appropriate aligned with respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations.	Not aligned with one or more of the following: program mission, respective agencies, regulations, and professional organizations.	

Components, Outcomes, and Measures: The components chosen to demonstrate program effectiveness (the extent to which the program fulfills the college mission, the program mission and the EMP), the outcomes for those components, and the measures used to gather data demonstrating outcome achievement.

Criterion	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing	Missing
Range of Components	Components represent the three major categories of review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Function</u> • <u>Institutional Support</u> • <u>Accountability</u> 	Components represent only two of the major categories of review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Function</u> • <u>Institutional Support</u> • <u>Accountability</u> 	Components represent only one of the major categories of review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Function</u> • <u>Institutional Support</u> • <u>Accountability</u> 	
Outcome Measurability	All outcomes are measurable and logical	The majority of outcomes are measurable and logical	Fewer than half of the outcomes are a measurable and logical.	
Measures	All measures directly link to and assess the objectives.	The majority of measures directly link to and assess the objectives.	Fewer than half of the measures directly link to and assess the objectives.	
Use of Data	Objectives are measured using <u>consistent data sets</u> . Supporting attachments include <u>qualitative and quantitative data</u> .	Objectives are measured using <u>consistent data sets</u> . Supporting attachments include <u>quantitative data</u> .	Objectives are not measured using <u>consistent data sets</u> . Supporting attachments include <u>no quantitative data</u> .	
Targets	Includes both ideal and acceptable targets and rationale using <u>benchmark data</u> .	Includes both ideal and acceptable targets and rationale.	Includes both ideal and acceptable targets and does NOT include rationale.	

Findings and Recommendations: A concise summary of the results gathered from the activities chosen to demonstrate program effectiveness. Includes quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Criterion	Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing	Missing
Summary of Findings	All findings include detailed analysis of the effectiveness of program components included in the review	The majority of findings include detailed analysis of the effectiveness of program components included in the review	Fewer than half of the findings include detailed analysis of the effectiveness of program components included in the review	
Recommendations for Improvement	All recommendations directly relate to program effectiveness connect to specific EMP priorities and are based on analysis of measures. They detail logical <i>next steps</i> for improving the program in response to the findings. Including C&I planning.	All recommendations relate to program effectiveness, connect to the EMP and are based on analysis of findings. Some detail logical <i>next steps</i> for improving the program in response to the findings.	Recommendations are anecdotal rather than based on analysis of findings. <i>Next steps</i> do not relate to the findings.	