



Institutional Research

Integrated Planning Process Evaluation Report 2015-2016 (May 2016)

Executive Summary

Mesa College's integrated planning process underwent significant revisions in the 2014-2015 academic year, many of which were informed from the previous year's process evaluation. The goals of the 2015-2016 revisions included the following:

1. Expand training for Liaisons
2. Streamline the information required in the Program Review module.
3. Bring training to Lead Writers via expanded outreach efforts.
4. Revise BARC request form to improve usability and accessibility of information.
5. Pilot standard data sets for Student Services areas.
6. Institute a soft deadline for Lead Writers to submit their Program Reviews to their Deans/Managers for review and feedback.

Each of the above recommendations were met during the 2015-2016 academic year. For example:

- Additional training opportunities were added for Program Review Liaisons
- Given that 2015/16 was an update year, the Program Review module was streamlined and only the most essential program review elements (program updates, assessment summary, student achievement data analysis, and goal status updates) were included as requirements
- Lead Writer training was provided in a variety of venues, including school meetings, in order to expand access to training
- Multiple BARC forms were added to the Program Review core module in TaskStream (no longer a stand-alone form) in order to allow for saving and printing of requests
- Data dashboards were piloted for select Student Services departments, including EOPS, Counseling, and the Career Center/Evaluations Center/Transfer Center
- A soft deadline was instituted at the end of the fall semester to allow additional time for manager review and feedback

In an effort to continuously assess college systems and processes, in collaboration with the Program Review Committee, the Mesa College Institutional Research Office conducts an annual survey of Program Review Lead Writers, Liaisons, and Deans/Managers. In addition, in March 2016, a group interview was conducted with Program Review Lead Writers and Liaisons to gather feedback about the training and support for the Program Review process and the Program Review module. Finally, an additional survey was administered to members of the College's resource allocation recommendation committees. The goal of these efforts was to gather feedback from all groups and perspectives involved in the integrated planning and Program Review processes at the College. Looking forward, based on the results of the 2015-2016 Integrated Planning Survey, group interview, and resource allocation recommendation committee feedback, there are several ways in which the Program Review and integrated planning processes could be improved. The recommendations for the 2016-2017 Program Review cycle are outlined on the following page.

Recommendations presented to the Program Review Steering Committee 5/6/16; Full report submitted to the Program Review Steering Committee 5/9/16

Presented to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee 5/10/16

Presented to the President's Cabinet 5/17/16

1. Provide Additional Research/Data Training and Resources

Responses to the Integrated Planning Survey and group interview with Lead Writers, Liaisons, and managers revealed that some Lead Writers were unclear on how they should interpret the data provided for instructional programs. Some Lead Writers indicated they were unable to attend research and data workshops due to their schedules. Other Lead Writers mentioned that the instructions for the data analysis section of the Program Review were vague and that they required additional resources and assistance to complete the section. In addition, a few Liaisons mentioned that their assigned Lead Writers struggled in responding to the equity data analysis prompt in the Program Review module. With this in mind, there appears to be a need for additional guidance, training, and resources for Lead Writers. For the 2016/17 cycle, additional research/data workshops could be scheduled at various times of day and on different days of the week. Furthermore, instructional Program Review data have been provided in tabular format up through the 2015/16 Program Review cycle. For 2016/17, data could be provided in a visual format (graphs, charts, and/or dashboards) to facilitate data interpretation among Lead Writers.

2. Improve the Submission and Feedback Process within TaskStream

A few survey respondents and a number of participants in the group interview with Lead Writers, Liaisons, and managers expressed frustration with the Program Review submission process. The 2015/16 submission process, as in previous cycles, required Lead Writers to submit a notification to their reviewers and then take additional steps to submit Program Review. Based on the feedback received, this process appeared to create some confusion among Lead Writers due to the various steps required to submit the Program Review. In addition, several Liaisons and some managers shared that the review process was challenging to implement through the TaskStream module. To address this issue moving forward, alternatives for providing feedback to Lead Writers (either outside of the TaskStream module or within the module) could be explored to facilitate the feedback and review process for Liaisons, Lead Writers, and managers. In addition, alternatives to the separate section submission process could be explored to improve the Lead Writer experience and reduce confusion with submissions.

3. Explore Options for Rolling Forward Resource Request Information

A number of Integrated Planning Survey respondents indicated that the resource request process could be streamlined such that previous year's resource request information could be pre-populated in future year's resource requests. This may include BARC requests, FHP requests, and CHP requests. While it should be noted that criteria for resource requests may change from year to year, it may streamline the process for Lead Writers if this information could be rolled forward to future years. This option may be examined and evaluated in order to improve the Lead Writer experience in the future.

4. Provide Additional Samples and/or Examples of Program Reviews

As in previous years, Lead Writers and Liaisons again requested additional samples and examples of Program Reviews in the future. Providing these examples and samples could help clarify expectations for Program Review content moving forward.

5. Revise the Program Review Website

Results of the Program Review Integrated Planning Survey revealed a large percentage of neutral responses relating to the Program Review website. Specifically, the percentage of favorable responses decreased while neutral responses increased. This may indicate that few Lead Writers and Liaisons actually accessed the Program Review website. Open-ended survey comments and group interview recommendations generally did not address the Program Review website; thus, it may be helpful to solicit targeted feedback from Lead Writers and Liaisons regarding the specific areas for improvement of the Program review website, such as enhancing the resources and expanding the information provided via the website.

6. Refine the Liaison Role and Review Process

Some comments in the Integrated Planning Survey indicated that there were opportunities to clarify expectations, roles, and responsibilities of Liaisons. This could include the inclusion of more content-related feedback and coaching related to Program Review content, specific guidelines and examples of frequently asked questions to expect from Lead Writers, and more training on what to look for in the Program Review module.

Recommendations presented to the Program Review Steering Committee 5/6/16; Full report submitted to the Program Review Steering Committee 5/9/16

Presented to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee 5/10/16

Presented to the President's Cabinet 5/17/16