

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012
Introduction to The Program Review Process for Administrative Units Programs

Program Review at Foothill College

Purpose

An effective program review supports continuous quality improvement to enhance student learning outcomes and, ultimately, increases student achievement rates. Program review aims to be a sustainable process that reviews, discusses, and analyzes current practices. The purpose is to encourage program reflection, and to ensure that program planning is related to goals at the institutional and course levels.

Process

Foothill College administrative units (below) are reviewed annually using this template, with an in-depth review occurring on a three-year cycle. Administrators, faculty and staff in departments who contribute to these programs will participate in program review. Vice Presidents provide feedback upon completion of the template and will forward the program review on to the next stage of the process, including resource prioritization at OPC and PaRC.

Administrative Units

Educational Resources and Instruction
Foothill Global Access
Instruction and Institutional Research
International and Distance Learning
Marketing and Communications
Middlefield Campus
Student Development and Instruction
Workforce Development and Institutional Advancement

Annual program review addresses five core areas, with a final section for administrator comments and their reflections about the next steps:

1. Data and trend analysis
2. Outcomes assessment
3. Program goals and rationale
4. Program resources and support
5. Program strengths/opportunities for improvement
6. Administrator's comments/reflection/next steps

Foothill College Program Review Cycle:

2011-2012: All programs participate in an annual program review

2012-2013: 1/3 of programs participate in a comprehensive review, remaining 2/3 of programs update their annual program review

Contact: Office of Instruction and Institutional Research (650) 949-7240

Website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/index.php>

Submission Deadline: All program review documents are due to Deans by December 16

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Basic Program Information

Administrative Unit Program Name: Office of Instruction & Institutional Research

Administrative Unit Mission:

Administrative sub-units covered in this program review:

Sub-Unit Name	Personnel	Position
Instruction	Kimberlee Messina Darya Gilani	Vice President Project Coordinator
Curriculum	Cori Nunez	Administrative Assistant
Articulation	Bernie Day Teresa De LA Cruz	Articulation/Curriculum Officer Program Assistant
Honors	Bernie Day Teresa De La Cruz	Honors Director Program Assistant
Institutional Research	Elaine Kuo	College Researcher

Program Review Team:

Name	Department	Position
Kimberlee Messina	Instruction and Institutional Research	Vice President
Darya Gilani	Instruction and Institutional Research	Coordinator
Cori Nunez	Instruction and Institutional Research	Administrative Assistant
Bernie Day	Instruction and Institutional Research	Articulation/Curriculum Officer Honors Institute Director
Elaine Kuo	Institutional Research & Planning	College Researcher
Teresa De La Cruz	Instruction and Institutional Research	Program Assistant

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program/Department Data

Dimension	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Students Served			
Faculty Served	All	All	All
Staff Served			
Full-time FTEF	1	1	1
Part-time FTEF	0	0	0
Full-time Staff	5	6	5
Part-time Staff	0	0	0

1.2 Using the data provided above, include a short narrative analysis of the following indicators. Please attach supporting studies or data to the final program review submitted to your Vice President.

- Numbers of Students/Faculty/Staff served (How was this tracked? What is the trend?):

The Office of Instruction and Institutional Research (I&IR) historically serves faculty and staff in the areas of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) identification, assessment and tracking, program review, and curriculum support. While the workload involved with these services intensified with accreditation and the accompanying site visit. I&IR continues to provide coordination and training in these support areas, even for programs and services not in the specific purview of instruction, such as Student Services and Workforce. With the elimination of the Office of Faculty and Staff (F&S) at the end of the 2008-2009 academic year, I&IR assumed many of that office’s responsibilities, including professional development, travel and conference, Professional Achievement Awards, equivalencies, Part-Time Faculty Orientation and Evening College. I&IR’s responsibilities increased again in Summer 2011 with the addition of International Programs and enrollment management. The VP of Instruction’s duties have also expanded to serving on the district negotiating team for faculty negotiations. I&IR continues to support the Integrated Planning and Budget (IP&B) task force, which meets every summer to respond to the governance survey results that guide strategic planning. The latest iteration of IP&B have continued their responsibilities into the 2011-2012 academic year as they have proposed the establishment of a Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC will be charged with taking a major role in program review, as 1/3 of all programs will have to complete a comprehensive review every three years. This initiative, while helping to provide better feedback to the programs and its faculty and staff, will further increase the workload of I&IR.

The Curriculum office serves all faculty, staff and administrators with all aspects of the curriculum process and information, especially as it relates to college publications. The office provides training for the C3MS system, a writing and approval program for course

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

outlines and program sheets. Serving as a document repository for the College Curriculum Committee and the General Education Review Committees, the office also respond to requests from the general public, administrators, faculty, staff and institutions about previous course and program information. In addition, the Curriculum office is the primary link between the college and the CCCC, as well as providing support to the college's MIS reporting to the state.

IR serves the entire campus as evidenced with program review, as this office generates the annual data sheets used by programs. IR also responds to research requests from administrators, faculty, staff and students ranging from survey design to longitudinal data analyses. In the 2010-2011 academic, the College Researcher completed over 70 requests, including items related to strategic planning (e.g. EMSP). IR provides the institutional response to outside data requests and reports; examples include grant proposals and deliverables as well as state reports such as the ARCC report. The workload for this office is expected to increase steadily as the institution moves toward more data-driven decision-making and more requests will be made regarding tracking and completion data. The addition of comprehensive program review data will also initially increase the workload until some automation can be developed.

Articulation

The need for articulation information increases annually. Usage of the articulation database (primarily by students and counselors) is staggering. According to official **ASSIST** records, **Foothill articulation information was requested 244,802 times between Jan. 1 2010 and Dec. 31 2010.** These figures **do not** include the number of times articulation information was utilized for information related to private and out-of-state colleges and universities through the Foothill articulation/transfer web page and through contact with Foothill counselors.

Articulation information supported the 1634 students who received assistance from the Transfer Center. Any of the thousands of students who meet with counselors each year educational plans related to transfer are recipients of our efforts. With increases in enrollment (especially the increasing number of students who are transfer-directed but who are unable to enroll at impacted state universities), the number of students requiring accurate articulation information increases.

Based upon ASSIST historical data, it is estimated that ASSIST usage for Foothill articulation information has been **increasing steadily at a rate of 8-10 percent annually.** Maintaining our existing articulation while developing and implementing new articulation agreements in response to campus expectations is challenging with current staffing.

Articulation Data

We created and/or maintain articulation with the following CSU and UC campuses.
(Source: ASSIST)

<u>University</u>	<u>CSU/UC Articulation Agreements</u>	
	<u>No. of Majors Depts</u>	
California Polytechnic University, Pomona	91	51
California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo	65	89

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

California State University, Bakersfield	31	43	
California State University, Channel Islands			22 34
California State University, Chico	132	58	
California State University, Dominguez Hills	56	42	
California State University, East Bay	93	39	
California State University, Fullerton	11	19	
California State University, Long Beach	134	92	
California State University, Los Angeles	57	79	
California State University, Monterey Bay	56	21	
California State University, Northridge	73	58	
California State University, Sacramento	45	41	
California State University, San Bernardino	74	58	
California State University, San Marcos	31	38	
California State University, Stanislaus	15	12	
Humboldt State University	70	37	
San Diego State University			100 51
San Francisco State University	84	86	
San Jose State University	135	72	
Sonoma State University	30	19	
University of California, Berkeley	108	59	
University of California, Davis	132	110	
University of California, Irvine	84	13	
University of California, Los Angeles		124	
University of California, Merced	22	22	
University of California, Riverside	83	61	
University of California, San Diego	139	37	
University of California, San Francisco		2	
University of California, Santa Barbara	93	61	

For 2010-2011, the articulation office secured UC approval for 48 additional Foothill courses, CSU GE/Breadth articulation approval for 19 additional courses, and IGETC approval for 8 additional courses. For 2011-2012, the articulation office secured UC approval for 56 additional courses, CSU GE/Breadth approval for 26 additional courses, and IGETC approval for 13 courses. The articulation office submitted dozens of courses for the new statewide Course Identification System C-ID. Some C-ID courses were already approved.

Evaluating our productivity and effectiveness using the same measures for direct student or instruction services is inappropriate because the goal of the articulation office is to establish articulation agreements and provide relevant resources and instruments to support student transfer. Since all of the transfer-directed student programs utilize our products, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the diversity of our service recipients reflects the diversity of the transfer-bound student Foothill College student population.

Honors

Interest and participation in the Honors Institute has increased dramatically in the past ten years. In 2000, there were approximately 100 or fewer honors students, with 14 students completing the Honors Scholar program. In 2011, there are nearly **450** regular honors students and an estimated additional **200** provisional honors students. The number of courses offered quarterly has increased dramatically as well, with an average of 13-15 courses that fill very quickly offered each quarter.

Student usage is high...and increasing. Examples include:

1. 15-50 individual student conferences/week with staff (varies depending upon the time of quarter). Contact hours vary significantly during registration periods. The Program Assistant maintains a record of office student contacts that includes students' names and ID.

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

2. Communication with honors students also occurs regularly via email. The office maintains an up-to-date student email distribution list. The Program Assistant communicates regularly with prospective and current honors students. The email load can be very heavy, necessitating hours of email response time in some days.
3. Present approximately 36 Honors CNSL classroom presentations per academic year. With an average of 25 students (+/-) per CNSL class, this represents contact with approximately **900 additional students** per year. This outreach has been instrumental in recruiting underrepresented students.
4. Serving students through numerous Honors workshops that include: UCLA Transfer (2); UCLA TAP (5); Honors Symposium Proposal Writing (3); New Honors Student Orientation sessions (8); Selective College Transfer (2); Research Symposium Rehearsal Workshops (3); and more. Workshops average 20-50 students per session.
5. Staff presentations at New Student Orientation, local high schools, and various Foothill outreach events.
6. Honors faculty development workshops (1-3 annually)
Honors counselors (4) provide specialized counseling; however, data is unavailable regarding the number of honors students served. Student feedback suggests that students do not have adequate access to honors counselors due to a long waiting period for appointments.

2. Staffing structure (Does the staffing structure meet the program's or department's needs? If yes, please explain. If not, consider the following prompts in framing your answer.)

- i. Which aspects of the work are key to the institution's mission?
All aspects of the Office of Instruction serve the core missions of transfer, basic skills and workforce. The office plays a critical role in program review, student learning outcomes, curriculum, program development, and enrollment management.
- ii. Has the staff increased, decreased or remained the same to meet those changes?
In 2001, this office had four classified employees: one Administrative Assistant I (secretary to the Vice President of Instruction), one Administrative Assistant II (Curriculum coordinator), and two Senior Administrative Assistants (coordinator of Workforce Development and a Program coordinator for the campus-wide committees and projects). The Administrative Assistant I and one of the Senior Administrative Assistant positions no longer exist. The Vice President eliminated the secretary position in an attempt to retain other classified staff during a financial downturn while the Senior Admin Assistant retired, and budget cuts prevented that position from being filled. Some of the duties of these two positions transferred to the remaining two classified positions.
With the loss of a level 48 Executive Assistant in November 2009, several duties were moved to other administrative units, but workload increased overall as changes to the accreditation and budget and planning processes have evolved. The College Researcher position, which has an indirect reporting line to the VP of Instruction, was filled in the 2010-2011 academic year and supports data and

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

strategic planning needs of administrators, faculty and staff. Greater efficiency would be possible if there were an additional researcher supported by I&IR. Despite a significant increase in work output and the number of students served, staffing for articulation and honors were reduced dramatically over the past ten years. In 2002, staffing for these programs included one full-time faculty articulation/curriculum officer, one full-time (12-month) program assistant for articulation, one full-time faculty assigned to direct the Honors Institute and one full-time (11-month) program assistant to support honors. For the past several years, the Articulation/Curriculum Officer has served a temporary 10% overload assignment to direct the honors institute until an appropriate person is appointed to serve as the permanent honors director. A 10% faculty overload is insufficient to effectively operate a program of this size. The current faculty lead agreed to coordinate the program when no other faculty would accept a 40% release for the position. (One interested faculty member was willing to consider the position if allotted 100% release time). Because of the sizeable workload, other faculty who were recruited would not accept the honors assignment. Note: A local CCC campus with a comparable honors program (but one-half the student population of Foothill's) has 65% faculty release for program coordination. There is a critical need for long-term program/staff planning to ensure program continuance, especially if the current program director is unable to continue with the overload assignment. When the two full-time program assistants were reduced to one 11-month program assistant, the programs were impacted. Closing the office for four consecutive weeks impacts student access and workflow.

- iii. Has technology made it possible to do more work with the same staff? Or, has technology increased your workload (adding web features which need updating for example)? In what way?

In 2005-2006, a new campus-based software system for the course outline and program sheet approval process was adopted and implementation began in Fall 2006. . This technology allows the writing and approval of curriculum to be transparent and easily accessible for faculty, staff and administrators. Additionally, the possibility that hard-copy outlines and their attachments could be misplaced no longer exists with the electronic system as every entry can now be seen and monitored by a system administrator.

The district's implementation of the Sungard's Banner system in the 2010-2011 academic year has seen a substantial workload increase. The new system increased the number of screens for each course from one screen to fifteen.

Meanwhile, the State Chancellor's Office also instituted a new software package for reporting curriculum information. The navigation of this software involved a steep learning curve that required considerable staff time. This software change, which enforces Title V curriculum rules, now requires a formal State approval process before a new course can be taught. Each piece of curriculum for new and updated courses now requires multiple approvals by various

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

committees/bodies and multiple addendums that necessitates hand tracking of the paperwork involved. Given the changes in the State curriculum reporting requirements, an additional classified staff is needed to support the increased curriculum and scheduling workload.

The implementation of the TracDat software that replaces C3MS for SLOs further adds to the current workload especially as it relates to faculty and staff training. While this technology will be much easier and more user friendly for faculty compared to C3MS, there is an ongoing maintenance and updating function that has been added to the existing workload in I&IR.

The migration to Banner saw an increase in workload for IR as the new database system required the development of queries to replace systems previously set up to work with the old Student Information system. Merging the two databases continues to be ongoing. Technology has helped streamline the articulation proposal process by reducing time for course approval and cutting mailing costs because we can now distribute curriculum materials such as course outlines electronically; however, we need additional time and staff training to adequately update and maintain the appropriate web pages upon which students rely so heavily.

- iv. Does the workload have significant peaks and valleys during the fiscal year? If so, describe.

I&IR's workload is constant. The fall and winter terms are typically very busy due to program review and the spring term involves resource allocation requests and prioritization process, as well as state reporting requirements for Basic Skills. Fall 2011 saw an additional workload increase due to the TracDat system implementation, which also necessitated holding numerous trainings for faculty and staff.

The curriculum updating process does have peaks and valleys for the various parts of the process. Between December and March, course outlines are updated for the next catalog, where corrections to approximately 900 courses and their corresponding curriculum sheets are made. From April through June the course catalog is prepared for print and this process involves reviewing several drafts. Program information is updated with the State Chancellor's office in July and August to ensure proper state reporting.

IR has a steady workload throughout the year, with spikes in requests primarily in the fall with program review and spring with planning and resource allocation (e.g. EMSP, core mission objectives/reflections, OPC funding process, etc.). The workload is distributed fairly evenly throughout the year, with extremely heavy articulation/curriculum periods in November/December when Foothill curriculum review deadlines coincide with university application deadlines such as UC and CSU annual submissions for GE course review. The Honors Institute is overwhelmed with students in February-March with the UCLA Transfer Alliance Program certification deadline, Honors Symposium preparation, and letters of

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

recommendation for transfer students.

- v. Do you anticipate the workload will increase, decrease or remain constant in the upcoming one to three years? Is this a temporary situation?

The workload is anticipated to increase as the dire funding situation at the state level is not forecasted to change significantly in the next five years.

Until TracDat is fully implemented within the next two to three years (program review is on a three year cycle for in-depth reviews), there will be demands for reporting functions to departments, divisions and state organizations on a quarterly basis. The accreditation process continues to impact the workload as follow up and mid term reports will require significant effort, as work continues with strategic planning at the institutional level (e.g. integrated planning and budget process). Finally, additional institutional research requests may occur as the program review process becomes more data-driven. IR's involvement in research and planning initiatives may affect efficiency in both areas, especially limiting the amount of research requests that can be completed.

Based upon available data, it appears that the need for articulation services in support of transfer students will continue to increase. Foothill is engaged in new curriculum developments to support both transfer and basic skills students by developing integrated curriculum that streamlines the road to universities. Articulating these (innovative) non-traditional courses is labor and time-intensive. Articulation approval is an integral part of securing enrollment in these new basic skills to transfer courses.

Due to decreased access, the number of Foothill students transferring to CSU has decreased 40 percent in the past five years. (Source: CPEC) With decreased access to the CSU and UC campuses due to overcrowding and budget restrictions, more students are seeking opportunities at Foothill College for transfer to independent and out-of-state colleges and universities. The most recent CCCCO data (published March, 2011) reported that 454 Foothill students transferred to independent and out-of-state colleges and universities in 2008-2009. This number has been increasing steadily over the past several years. In order to facilitate course transferability for these students, it is incumbent upon us to establish additional articulation agreements and transfer pathways. Establishing new transfer/articulation relationships with institutions requires an enormous amount of time.

As access to universities becomes more competitive, students are looking for transfer pathways that give them an edge in admission. The Honors Institute staff expects that its growing population will continue to surge as students see program participation as a benefit in university selection. More than ever, universities are encouraging prospective students to participate in honors programs to demonstrate their transfer readiness.

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

- vi. If your workload is increasing and resources will not allow for increased staffing, how do you anticipate being able to ameliorate the negative consequences of too much work and maintain a positive atmosphere?

Staff in this office continue to work collaboratively and productively. For example, increased collaboration has taken place between Curriculum, Scheduling and the Academic Services staff. Prioritization of IR requests may not meet all research demands. However, the resources are not sufficient to support current key functions, and if new resources are not available sharing or shifting resources with other offices will need to be explored.

Articulation and honors staff tend to push themselves to meet the demands, although we must prioritize the requests for articulation and assistance, recognizing that some projects may need to be revised or deleted. The staff work cooperatively and try to maintain a sense of humor when the time needed to accomplish tasks exceeds the time available.

- vii. What steps can be taken to improve your unit's organizational efficiency within its current budget?

Funds are being reviewed. Efforts will be made in Winter 2012 to make tracking and budgeting more efficient. Without an administrative assistant, the budgeting and tracking of B budgets has not been as high of a priority. Additionally, there are FOAPs that experience high rollover amounts, and these accounts can be reviewed and discussed at the unit level to improve resource allocation.

The articulation officer and program assistant conduct an annual retreat to plan the academic year's goals and to prioritize projects. Being on the same page is critical. Engaging staff in professional development training related to web page management, BANNER, database management, etc. might increase efficiency and reduce time to task completion.

- viii. What strategies have been used to improve the delivery of services within the program or department? Close collaboration between Curriculum and SLOs has been extremely helpful in coordinating communications and processes during a change in technology platforms and state regulations.

3. Budget analysis categories of *expenditures* (A Budget, Equipment, Supplies)

Expenditures in the office are generally tracked by the Academic Services Coordinator on a quarterly basis. Following is a summary of largest categories of expenses:

Account	Budget	Common Expenses
Instruction	\$10,454	Travel and Conference, Office Supplies, Printing, Dues and Memberships
Curriculum	\$1,550	Travel and Conference, Office Supplies, Printing
Articulation	\$7,350	Travel and conference,

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

		catalog mailing, memberships and dues, Foothill promotional materials, supplies for workshops and presentations, printing, office supplies
Honors	\$7,950	Office supplies, printing, faculty/student registration at research symposium, dues and support of Community College Research Symposium, faculty development77 workshops, conference and travel.

4. Basic skills programs (If applicable)

This office is the lead administrator of the Basic Skills Initiative. The College Skills Committee was reformed in Fall 2010 into the Basic Skills Workgroup, which is one of the institution’s four Core Mission Workgroups. The Basic Skills Workgroup continues to lead the Basic Skills Initiative planning at Foothill College, and is represented at Planning and Resource Council (PaRC). The VP of Instruction serves as Ex-Officio on this committee while the Coordinator for I&IR and College Researcher serve as members. The workgroup reports to the Chancellor’s office every summer, and monitors an annual budget of about \$90k.

5. Transfer programs: (If applicable)

Honors

In keeping with the Foothill College mission to prepare a well-educated population that sustains and enhances a democratic society, the Foothill College Honors Institute is committed to providing access to outstanding enhanced educational opportunities for all students. The program provides enhanced transfer opportunities for students, which is closely aligned with the College transfer mission. Many of our students have struggled through adversity to achieve intellectual growth. The Honors institute recruits and cultivates honors students, nurturing and encouraging those students who might never have considered themselves capable of success in an enhanced learning environment or transferring to a selective university. Rather than presenting itself as a selective entity, the Honors Institute welcomes all students and especially encourages students remediating through Basic Skills courses to strive toward participation in the honors program.

Articulation

The mission of the Articulation Office is to facilitate student transfer by collaborating with Foothill College and university faculty, intersegmental articulation officers, staff, college and university evaluators, segmental (UC Office of the President, CSU Chancellor’s Office, CCC Chancellor’s Office, AICCU- independent colleges and universities, and system-wide programs (e.g. C-ID, ASSIST) to ensure maximum transferability of Foothill courses...and to communicate articulation information clearly to students. The articulation office is responsible for the development of internal policies and practices to support articulation

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

and the dissemination of articulation information to students, counselors, faculty, staff, administrators and the campus community.

Articulation provides the mechanism for seamless student transfer--one of the primary missions of Foothill College. This office provides a critical service to other service providers. The articulation office serves as a resource for counseling and instructional faculty, staff and administrators on all matters related to articulation and the creation of transferable curriculum in an effort to strengthen the relationship between Foothill curriculum and transfer requirements. In support of the Foothill College mission, a sound articulation program with an extensive articulation base is the foundation for a successful transfer program as it establishes course equivalencies between Foothill College and 4-year institutions and provides students with course curriculum that will meet their transfer requirements. Students who are able to access important information and to establish clear and accurate educational plans are more likely to become engaged in college, maintain their enrollment and make progress toward their transfer goals. Foothill College was recently cited in a CCCCO Transfer Velocity Report as being number one in transfer rates.

6. CTE programs: Labor/Industry alignment (If applicable)
N/A

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

2.1. Insert – Previous year’s Four Column Report for AU-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column
 Foothill College
 AU - Instruction & Institutional Research

Mission Statement: The mission of the Office of Instruction and Research is to shape the future direction and environment of student learning at Foothill through the implementation of creative solutions and innovative ideas in conjunction with evidence-based decision making and research.

Administrative Unit SLOs (AU-SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Action & Follow-Up
AU - Instruction & Institutional Research - 1 - Student Information - Students have access to current college catalog, course outlines and Student Learning Outcomes. Year(s) to be Assessed: 2010-2011 2011-2012 AU-SLO Status: Active	Assessment Method: An annual spring survey will be distributed to all Faculty, Staff and Administrators containing a question for each AUO with 5 possible responses: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly agree and Not Applicable/Other. Assessment Method Type: Survey Target: The target is to achieve an 80% agreement (Agree or Strongly Agree) rate among all respondents.	09/07/2011 - Agree = 46.7% Strongly Agree = 38.9% Total = 85.6% Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011 Resource Request: The Office of Instruction is not sufficiently staffed to serve the overall flow of curriculum and state accounting. There is a need for a FT classified staff member to assist with curriculum and scheduling.. Related Documents: Spring 2011 AUO Survey Results	10/14/2011 - Although the target was met, there are many areas for improvement. The Office of Instruction will continue to provide training on Tracdat, and improve the accessibility of SLOs to the internal and external audience via the website.
AU - Instruction & Institutional Research - 2 - Core Mission Instruction - Students are offered career, workforce and basic skills instruction with approved college curriculum in accordance to Title 5 and the Educational Code. Year(s) to be Assessed: 2010-2011 2011-2012 AU-SLO Status: Active	Assessment Method: An annual spring survey will be distributed to all Faculty, Staff and Administrators containing a question for each AUO with 5 possible responses: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly agree and Not Applicable/Other. Assessment Method Type: Survey Target: The target is to achieve an 80% agreement (Agree or Strongly Agree) rate among all respondents.	09/07/2011 - Agree = 52.3% Strongly Agree = 33% Total = 85.3% Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011 Related Documents: Spring 2011 AUO Survey Results	

2.3 Please provide observations and reflections below.

2.3.a Administrative Unit Student Learning Outcomes

What findings can be gathered from the AU-SLOs assessments?

The key findings indicate that I&IR, with one exception, are meeting its targets in the areas identified. These outcomes directly relate to the core mission of supporting faculty and staff with regards to student learning.

The one area where the target was not met involves tenure processes, and that outcome has been revised to be in alignment with what I&IR does to support that process.

2.3.b Does any of the data suggest that revisions might be necessary in order to support faculty, staff and/or students to successfully achieve the AU-SLOs?

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Yes. One outcome was revised, an addition was made regarding non-credit curriculum, and the goal to improve the visibility of the SLO process was further refined. While I&IR is making great progress, the key area for improvement is web placement of course and program SLOs.

2.3.c Do the AU-SLOs reflect the support faculty, staff and/or students need from those services in order to succeed?

Yes.

2.3.d How has assessment of AU-SLOs led to improvement in student success at the institution?

The very process of assessing and reflecting has led to dialogue with faculty and staff, and refined the needs and outcomes to better serve students. The addition of new non-credit curriculum, along with the implementation of TracDat software, is providing better tools and success for students.

2.4 Annual Action Plan and Summary: Using the information above, list the program's action steps, the related Core Mission objective, SLO assessment data and the expected impact on student success.

Action Step	Related AU-SLO assessment (Note applicable data)	Related ESMP Core Mission Goals (Basic Skills, Transfer, Work Force, Stewardship of Resources)	How will this action improve student learning/success?
Continue to provide training on TracDat and SLOs.	AU-SLO 1, and attached data.	All	Faculty reflections on student learning, and the changes in curriculum or other instructional aspects will be more visible to the college community and will increase opportunity for dialogue and collaboration.
Collaborate with office staff and faculty to improve curriculum processes, especially as it relates to Title V and Education Code compliance.	AU-SLO 1 and 2	All	Better curriculum processes will enable faculty to focus more time and energy on student learning.
Collaborate with faculty and staff to improve web accessibility to SLOs.	AU-SLO 1 and 2	All	Students and the community will have better access to the learning outcomes and assessments, which will lead to improved learning. (how so?)

Annual Administrative Unit Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad and incorporate some sort of measurable action that connects to Foothill’s core missions, Educational & Strategic Master Plan (ESMP), the division plan, and SLOs.

3.1 Program relation to college mission/core missions

The Office of Instruction and Institutional Research supports all instruction at Foothill College, with an emphasis on transfer, workforce and basic skills.

3.2 Previous program goals from last academic year

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
Goals were listed in form of AUOs for 2010-2011			

3.3 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	Supporting Action Steps from section 2.4 (if applicable)	How will this goal improve student success?
Continue efforts to improve the assessment of program reviews and the evaluation mechanisms used in improving instructional and non-instructional programs and services.	2-3 Years (Currently we are in year 1 of the new Program Review process, which utilizes comprehensive SLO assessment reports) Next year will be the first year of the re-envisioned Program Review Committee (PRC).	-TracDat Trainings -SLO Accessibility	Comprehensive SLO assessment embedded in the annual program review process will strengthen the institution’s ability to make informed planning and budget decisions.
Further institutionalize the new governance structure.	1 year/Ongoing (Currently in year three of the new “PaRC” structure, revisions continue to be made. This year, expected refinement will occur in the role of OPC and the resource allocation process.		More informed resource allocation and documentation of decisions and processes will enable all shared governance participants to understand how decisions are made and where further refinement is needed.
Establish a institutional research agenda	Ongoing		An institutional research agenda can help with strategic planning and provide focus regarding resource prioritization.

Draft Annual AU Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Use the tables below to summarize your program’s resource requests.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff

Position	\$ Amount Classification/%	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
Curriculum Technician	100% to serve curriculum and scheduling needs. (Classification 46)		General Fund, or reassignment of existing personnel.
Administrative Assistant 2	100% to fill the vacant position in the Office of Instruction. (Classification of N-46)		General Fund, or reassignment of existing personnel.

B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
SLO Coordinator	25-50% Release time for a full time faculty member. In the past, the office of Instruction paid for this cost out of a grant. Now we need institutional support to offset this cost.	TracDat trainings and workshops, continued improvement of Program Review process	General fund
TracDat License Renewal	\$10,758	TracDat trainings and workshops, continued improvement of Program Review process	General Fund

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
Designated space for honors students.		Building honors community and to adhere to UCLA TAP participation guidelines.	

One-time/Other: (Release time, training, etc.)

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)

Draft Annual AU Program Review Template for 2011-2012

N/A			
-----	--	--	--

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Use the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to faculty, staff and/or students’ needs, briefly analyze the program’s strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities and challenges to the program. Consider external and internal factors, such as demographic, economic, educational, and societal trends. Some considerations may include current and future demand for the program, similar programs at other comparable institutions, and potential auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	Highly qualified and dedicated staff. Existing committee and governance structures. TracDat and other technological support.	Foothill College’s instruction has an excellent reputation in community.
Weaknesses	Not enough staff to support increased workload.	Changing labor market and continuing weak economy
Opportunities	Programmatic development.	Changing labor market and continuing weak economy are both a threat and an opportunity as we consider programmatic development.
Threats		Reduced enrollment and funding. Increased workload expectations from CCCCO. Changing legislation that impacts funding and student success.

5.2 Are there any critical issues you expect to face in the coming year? How will you address those challenges?

Enrollment challenges continue to be an issue as the program review process becomes further defined and this issue will also affect efforts towards full compliance in terms of FTES reporting and curricular requirements.

5.3 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

None.

5.4 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles.

None.

5.5 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

I&IR is dedicated and committed to serving student learning and success. The office works collaboratively improving systems and processes to better facilitate and support instruction.

Draft Annual AU Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Great strides have been made in curriculum, SLOs, program review, and data driven decision-making.

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the President to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

Assessment findings show that ratings targets were met for AU-SLOs related to student mission and core mission instruction. A key indicator of I&IR's success is our unqualified reaffirmation of accreditation in January 2012.

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

None.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

Given the assignment of enrollment management to I&IR as of Winter 2012, it is recommended that there be better tools developed and used routinely by the Deans to more strategically schedule course offerings that will meet our productivity and FTES goals.

6.4 Recommended next steps:

Proceed as planned on program review schedule

Further review/Out of cycle in-depth review