
2019-20 Program Review Evaluation

SEMPC
December 2020

José G Carrillo
Director of Institutional Research

www.imperial.edu



OFFICE of INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
Supporting Decision-Making

In this presentation...


- Review results from 2019-20 Program Review Cycle Evaluation
- Recommendations



Respondents

Please indicate the program review you completed:

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Completed Academic Area Program Review	41.67% 10
Completed Service Area Program Review	41.67% 10
Assisted our department to enter program review in SPOL	8.33% 2
Approved an Academic or Service Area Program Review	8.33% 2
TOTAL	24



Academic Data

The academic data set is useful for conducting my program review

Answered: 9 Skipped: 15



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Strongly agree	33.33% 3
Agree	44.44% 4
Neither agree nor disagree	11.11% 1
Disagree	11.11% 1
Strongly disagree	0.00% 0
TOTAL	9



Recommendations on Academic Data

- Provide success & retention numbers as an aggregate
- Have data for the courses within the specific program, instead of individual data sets for courses within each subject matter.
- The data files are great. They do help. In my area, it would be helpful to also have information regarding students and faculties' needs.



	I DO NOT KNOW	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Support was available to answer any program review questions	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5.88% 1	35.29% 6	58.82% 10	17	4.53
My SLO/SAO Outcomes are key to developing my annual objectives	0.00% 0	17.65% 3	5.88% 1	35.29% 6	35.29% 6	5.88% 1	17	3.24
My annual objectives support the Vision for Success Goals	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	88.24% 15	11.76% 2	17	4.12
I was given enough time to complete the program review process	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5.88% 1	17.65% 3	64.71% 11	11.76% 2	17	3.82
The program review process is a valuable planning tool	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	11.76% 2	29.41% 5	47.06% 8	11.76% 2	17	3.59
The program review process was helpful in improving our program	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	23.53% 4	64.71% 11	11.76% 2	17	3.88
I am proud of the quality of work I did on the program review	5.88% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	29.41% 5	58.82% 10	5.88% 1	17	3.59
I routinely discuss my annual objectives with my supervisor	0.00% 0	17.65% 3	5.88% 1	29.41% 5	47.06% 8	0.00% 0	17	3.24



Improving Program Review Process

- More time, fall is too busy
- Data could be more user-friendly, SPOL issues
- Get a more user friendly and intuitive planning software
- Identify budget enhancements prior to the adoption of the budget in May
- Get specific feedback on our program reviews from administration after the process is done
- Have my supervisor meet with me more often to discuss objectives and SWOT



Improving Budget Enhancement Process

- We need to restructure this because at the end high priorities never get funded
- Only fund the items that go through program review, respect the process
- Limit participatory governance involvement to the subject matter experts and administration when it comes to prioritizing funding
- Include area for justification for additional budget, and more concrete and specific feedback on why budget requests were denied



Evaluating SPOL

- A more visually appealing system, one in which reports are readily available
- SPOL serves its purpose, we lost the accreditation warning we had after we implemented it
- Not a fan of SPOL, but this is the same across other CCC that they are all unhappy about their tools
- All tools will be the same, we need to value what program review brings to each program to make sure we take full advantage of this planning process
- User-friendliness is key in any new software



Recommendations

- Revise datasets to meet current needs
- Provide more training on planning tool software
- Evaluate SPOL and other options for planning/assessment
- Other – please provide input



Questions?



José G Carrillo
Director of Institutional Research
jose.carrillo@imperial.edu