Current language

Program Review will be completed annually by units in academic, student services and administrative services (pg. 20, *Integrated Planning 2021*, Sequoias Community College District).

Proposed language

Program Review will be completed biannually (every two years) by units in academic, student, and administrative services. Alternatively, units may submit a program review annually as needed.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data are presented below. Specific statements quoted below are meant to illustrate patterns identified during the review of the open-ended response data.

Quantitative Data

Question: "In the best interest of my Unit, Program Review needs to be completed:"

	Every Year	Every 2+ Years	N
Administrator	61%	39%	18
Full-Time Faculty	32%	68%	66
Adjunct Faculty	23%	77%	35
Staff	59%	41%	39
Overall	40%	60%	158

Qualitative Data

Arguments in favor of the move to biannual submission timeline

1. Units need more time (more than one year) to effectively both implement and evaluate actions.
   a. "I believe some departments would benefit from a more robust two year analysis, [rather] than a sometimes rushed annual gathering of data with little discussion." – *Anonymous Administrator*
   b. "When we change or institute new plans due our class schedule we need that much time to evaluate the change in multiple classes not just one or two. Sometimes we abandon good ideas because we do not have enough time to truly evaluate due to our course schedule." – *Anonymous Faculty Member*
   c. "I feel like a yearly review doesn't give enough time to see if changes are effective over the long term." – *Anonymous Staff Member*

2. Because the benefits of program review are often not captured with an annual cycle, annual reviews result in an inefficient use of the college's limited resources.
   a. "Program metrics are very stable for my unit. Meaningful patterns only seem to emerge over periods longer than one year. Seems like we are checking the "fuel gauge" every five miles." – *Anonymous Faculty Member*
   b. "Program reviews need to be both effective and efficient. Currently, it requires tremendous effort to accomplish. Units need more time to plan, implement/take actions, and assess progress made." – *Anonymous Administrator*

Arguments in favor or retaining the annual submission timeline
1. Unit structure and operations necessitate frequent/annual resource requests.
   a. "Typically our department has needs for an "Above Base Resource" or a need for new position and this process occurs each year. If Program Review only occurred every two years, for example, an area could miss out on needs for any particular fiscal year where a PR is not completed." – *Anonymous Administrator*
   b. "Since funding sources arise every year, resource requests should also be submitted annually." – *Anonymous Faculty Member*

2. Annual program reviews assist in keeping the unit focused and accountable.
   a. "The process we are using (even though it has challenges) keeps us all accountable on a regular annual cycle." – *Anonymous Administrator*
   b. "We are a large division with ever-evolving needs and interests. Doing program review every year helps us set goals and complete them. It also gives us a chance to launch new initiatives to help students. Without program review, I don't think a lot of innovation would happen." – *Anonymous Faculty Member*

Discussion

A large majority (60%) of survey respondents responded that a two (2) or more year cycle for program review would best serve their Unit. The proposed change to the Program Review process accommodates both the majority and minority positions by allowing reviews to be submitted both annually and biannually. Units who determine that annual submissions are necessary (whether to request resources or to support accountability) retain the option to do so. At the same time, the proposed change serves Units that may profit from a longer timeline (every other year) to evaluate program modifications or more efficiently manage limited resources.