

De Anza College Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Accreditation
Survey of Comprehensive Program Review Process
Spring 2024

Background

The Resource Allocation and Program Planning (RAPP) committee is charged to facilitate effective, efficient and timely program review, annual planning and budgeting processes for college programs and services. As part of its charge RAPP engaged in the [program review](#) cycle in line with the college's overall [planning cycle](#). The updated program review process included five main goals: (1) improve goal setting and alignment with program mission (2) align program review with resource and personnel requests, (3) streamline processes with forms specifically tailored to each area, (4) publish all forms in advance to increase transparency and availability, and (5) close the feedback loop by providing comments to each area for reflection and improvement.

The updated process for comprehensive program review took place in spring 2023 for student service areas and fall 2023 for all other areas. An [annual reflection](#) will take place in fall 2024 and start again with a comprehensive program review in spring 2026 for student service areas and fall 2026 for all other areas.

As part of the updated process, a unique form was created for each area. The instructional programs [form](#) included embedded data to streamline the data reflection process. A [form](#) specific to academic service areas was developed in collaboration with the area's associate vice president for instruction while the administrative services [form](#) was created in consultation with the area vice president. Student service areas chose to use the CAS [form](#) for their comprehensive program review. For the first time, all program review forms required areas to list goals for their area and identify how each goal will help the area meet its mission. Updates on each goal will be an essential part of the annual program review update process over the next two years.

A new element of the program review cycle was to provide feedback to each area. Each area had a feedback form tied to their program review form. RAPP engaged in a review and feedback loop of [student service](#) areas in fall 2023 and [instructional](#), [academic services](#) and [administrative service](#) areas in winter 2024.

In spring 2024, a link to a comprehensive program review feedback survey was sent to all department chairs, managers and deans in the areas of instruction, student services and academic services. This resulted in 22 responses, with 8 responses from student services,

13 from instructional areas, and 1 from academic services. There were no responses from administrative services.

Highlights Include:

Feedback from instruction and academic service areas was relatively positive, in that the process was improved through the specific forms for each area, the embedded data was easier to access and understand and the functionality of the form was improved in that users could collaborate in real-time.

Student Service areas had lower rates of satisfaction with the CAS form and new process. For example, there was an overall lack of connection between an area’s outcomes and how those outcomes should be aligned with their mission and how it should help them achieve their goals. There was also a lack of satisfaction with the CAS form itself.

For both areas, it was shared that the feedback provided by RAPP was clear, concise and informative in planning for the future.

Instructional and Academic Service Areas

Question 1: Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
It was easy to locate and navigate the new form.	2	5	3	1	0	11
The functionality of the form, being online and having the ability to share and collaborate with other colleagues, made it easy to complete.	2	6	1	2	0	11
The instructions were clear and easy to understand.	2	7	0	2	0	11
The question prompts were concise and clear.	2	4	1	3	0	10
The number of question prompts in the form was about right.	2	5	2	1	1	11
There was a clear purpose for each question prompt that was included.	2	5	0	3	1	11
The embedded data for instructional programs was easy to understand.	3	6	1	2	0	12
The process helped my area ensure our mission guides our work.	1	5	0	4	1	11
The process helped my area develop useful and actionable goals.	1	6	0	4	0	11
The process helped my area stay on track with our learning outcomes.	1	5	1	3	1	11
The process allowed our area to reflect on student success and equity gaps in meaningful ways.	1	6	1	2	1	11

The three highest positively ranked responses include:

- 82% of respondents (9) indicated they strongly agree or agree that the instructions were clear and easy to understand.
- 75% of respondents (9) indicated they strongly agree or agree that the embedded data for instructional programs was easy to understand.
- 73% of respondents (8) indicated they strongly agree or agree that the functionality of the form, being online and having the ability to share and collaborate with other colleagues made it easy to complete.

The three lowest positively ranked responses include:

- 55% (6) of respondents indicated they strongly agree or agree that the process helped their area stay on track with their learning outcomes.
- 55% (6) of respondents indicated they strongly agree or agree that the process helped their area ensure their mission guides their work.
- 60% (6) of respondents indicated they strongly agree or agree that the question prompts were concise and clear.

Question 2: What did you find most beneficial about the new comprehensive program review forms?

- Embedded data
- I like the simplicity and streamline approach to the Comprehensive Program Review.
- Easy to navigate and lead to purposeful discussions.
- Mallory was available to help.
- The access to the form through Student Success Analytics.
- The embedded data made life much easier.
- The introduction of 3 years' worth of goals happened to dovetail well with the arrival of a new full-time instructor in my department who is taking over the coordinator duties.
- The embedded data was a huge help, just a bit clunky and buggy to view certain data.

Question 3: What did you find most challenging about the comprehensive program review form?

- Lack of transparency and disengagement at the department level. Lack of awareness and training on the forms beyond the division level.
- I found the comprehensive program review form to be quite challenging. It felt like just another round of paperwork without a clear purpose. Not only was it too time-consuming, but the form itself was overly long, making it difficult to stay focused

and engaged throughout the process. It seemed like a repetitive exercise without much value or actionable insights. Overall, I found it frustrating and burdensome to complete.

- All of it. First off, the timing to complete was incredibly short and felt really disrespectful of the process if it's intended to be done thoughtfully. Then to discover that the timeline was kind of arbitrary is frustrating (as review of those PRs didn't happen until spring). The questions don't apply to all programs under our area. The direction to skip those that don't apply on a PR in which you're asked to reflect and sum up goals, challenges, successes in 6 questions or so means it's even fewer points of information to draw on that adequately tell the story of your program. As someone who really values the purpose of iterative reflection, I finally felt the dislike for this process that many of my colleagues have experienced in the past.
- The questions were many times too vague or required researching and decoding our college's overly complicated and wordy mission.
- Program Review form did not load data. Moving the process from Spring to Fall quarter was problematic, since Fall is the busiest quarter with students.

Student Services Areas

Question 1: Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
It was easy to locate and navigate the CAS form.	0	1	3	0	2	6
The instructions were clear and easy to understand.	0	2	2	0	3	7
The question prompts were concise and clear.	0	2	1	1	3	7
The number of question prompts in the form was about right.	0	1	3	1	2	7
There was a clear purpose for each question prompt that was included.	0	3	0	1	3	7
The process helped my area ensure our mission guides our work.	0	3	1	1	2	7
The process helped my area develop useful and actionable goals.	0	2	4	0	1	7
The process helped my area stay on track with our learning outcomes.	0	1	5	0	1	7
The process allowed our area to reflect on student success and equity gaps in meaningful ways.	0	2	2	1	2	7

There were no respondents who selected strongly agree, while 19 respondents selected strongly disagree, indicating an overall lack of satisfaction with the CAS form and/or the comprehensive program review process for student service areas.

The two highest positively rated responses include:

- 43% (3) indicated they agree that there was a clear purpose for each question prompt that was included.
- 43% (3) indicated they agree that the process helped their area ensure their mission guides their work.

The two lowest positively rated responses include:

- 14% (1) indicated they agree that the process helped their area stay on track with their learning outcomes.
- 14% (1) indicated they agree that the number of question prompts in the form was about right.

Question 2: What did you find most beneficial about the new comprehensive program review forms?

- ...the examples provided are on target: the format, goals, opportunity for reflection, tailored form for the Student Services area.
- opportunity for reflection
- It asked about goals and learning outcomes so it was an opportunity to reflect.
- Goals is what I liked best to help us also plan for the future.

Question 3: What did you find most challenging about the comprehensive program review form?

- It would be helpful if the form allowed for bullet points only. We tend to provide too many details and it is difficult to pare down.
- It was SO confusing and time consuming. We filled it out completely wrong and did not get satisfactory support throughout the process.
- The format was too long, it was hard to complete, it took way too much time, and very confusing.
- We had to rewrite the CAS multiple times because the deadline kept changing. Also, while we understand that this process is required for accreditation, the staff were taken away from their daily duties to complete this work. Staff shared that this process was very challenging to complete alongside meeting student demands.
- The data gathering was the most difficult.
- No clear direction and too much added work.

All Areas

Question 4: What is your level of agreement with the feedback provided by RAPP?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Clear and concise	1	6	1	0	1	9
Informative in planning for the future	0	5	2	1	0	8
An essential element of the program review process	1	4	4	0	0	9

Of respondents who indicated they received feedback from RAPP:

- 73% of respondents (7) indicated they strongly agree or agree that the feedback was clear and concise.
- 63% of respondents (5) indicated they agree that the feedback was informative in planning for the future.
- 56% of respondents (5) indicated they strongly agree or agree that the feedback was an essential element of the program review process.

Question 5: What did you find most beneficial about the feedback provided by RAPP?

- I didn't find it beneficial because we apparently did it incorrectly and/or incompletely...I am still not sure which one.
- What to do with the feedback was unclear initially. Moving forward, it would be ideal if there could be just one flow chart with each step alongside a due date.
- I found the feedback to be helpful and validating.
- At the time of completing this survey, I've not had the chance to review.
- It made the process more iterative, which is a plus.
- It was the first time anyone ever offered commendations. It was also helpful to know that RAPP read the program review closely

Question 6: Do you have any suggestions to improve feedback provided by RAPP?

- Have a representative from the group meet with the teams on a weekly basis with tasks/goals towards completing the process satisfactorily. Not only were the instructions vague; the organization of the roll-out lacked communication, which left our group floundering in the process.
- Please make timelines and exceptions crystal clear.
- I would like the reviewers to focus more on the goals of the department and the target audience of the program/services.
- Honestly, there was no direction on what to do with the feedback. Were we supposed to respond/submit something? It wasn't until I got an email from my dean a week later that I had any idea what to do with the feedback, and even then he just

asked "any comments or responses for RAPP?" That step in the process should be more clear. It would also be nice to get more direction from the committee itself rather than having to rely on our overworked and sometimes pulled-in-a-million-directions deans.

Question 7: Do you have any suggestions to improve the program review process, or would you like to add any additional details regarding your responses above?

- Improve the question to show a stronger connection to program needs, outcomes, and the RAPP process. Create a stronger culture of training and support for it
- The training was invaluable
- I still feel that RAPP doesn't reflect the work of the student services and it especially doesn't take into consideration the amount of work it involves. I think there needs to be another more direct approach to student services program review that doesn't require so much work...maybe a committee could go out and look at alternatives. If that is not realistic and the district has already paid for this process, there definitely needs to be individuals working with each group on a weekly basis, guiding them step by step through the process, especially if the college is looking for legitimate outcomes using RAPP.
- I don't know if we received feedback from RAPP. CAS standards is for student services but if that area offers courses, there wasn't a way to assess the courses. So, CAS felt like it was only for the student services side and neglected the instructional side.
- Not at this time. I would like a little more time to gauge the usability of the tool.
- More time to complete with a reasonable timeline. If we want to engage our colleagues in our area, minimum of 3 months to complete. Adaptable questions or a space for programs to include or elaborate on aspects of their programs that are being missed with the standardized questions. While I'm unsure about this point, something doesn't feel right about all comprehensive PRs being done at the same time. I am suspicious about how a PR is evaluated thoroughly when teams have to evaluate all of the programs that submit a PR at a time. Alternate the comprehensives for programs.
- These questions, and this whole process is really only valuable for larger departments, where departmental discussions can happen. For smaller departments (of maybe only one or two FT faculty members), it's really just paperwork. And the often-provided solution of "talk with other small departments" isn't the best solution because even in similar disciplines, individual departments can be run very differently in terms of course caps, student needs, objectives, etc.
- Move it out of Fall quarter.
- Suggestion: Read the PR document concurrently with the faculty request forms, as some information applies to both forms. I realize this adds time to the faculty recommendation process, but it may help.