

# **PCCD “2016 Program Review Users’ Survey” Report**



**June 15, 2016**

## **I. Introduction**

This report describes the results of the “2016 Program Review Users Survey” which was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program Review process. Program review was conducted district-wide during the fall of 2015 utilizing newly developed program review templates/handbooks. This survey was distributed to all four colleges and personnel at the District Office to obtain feedback from the users of the new handbooks and to assess the overall 2015 program review process.

## **II. Methodology**

The questions in the survey were developed by the Program Review Task Force. Membership of the task force and links to meetings and documents developed by the task force can be found at <http://web.peralta.edu/programreview/>. The “2016 Program Review Users Survey” was distributed electronically during February 2016 to all employees of the Peralta Community College District. Participants were asked to respond to twelve questions, including the site at which they worked and their position. Question 3 asked “Did you participate in completion of your department or unit program review during 2015-16?” If the response was “no” then the survey terminated for that participant. Thus, the resulting responses were only from individuals that had participated in the new program review process.

Several components in the 2015 Program Review process were different compared to previous program review cycles. First, a district-wide annual planning and program review calendar was developed to ensure coordination of submission of program review documents and resource requests. Two questions in the survey refer to the new timeline. Secondly, data was compiled and distributed district-wide by the District Office of Institutional Research. Three questions in the survey refer to the data distribution and the format of the data. Thirdly, because the templates/handbooks were new, two questions refer to opportunities for training on the new process. Finally, since many of the questions in the new program review process were new or more detailed than questions in previous program review cycles, two survey questions provided an opportunity to reflect upon the program review questions themselves.

### III. Survey Results

A total of 159 individuals completed the entire survey. Individuals that answered “no” to question 3 in the survey are not included in the results. Survey results were sorted by location and results are presented by college and/or District Office for comparison. Of the four colleges, Berkeley City College had the largest number of respondents (42 or 26%) and College of Alameda had the smallest number of respondents (10 or 6%) and were faculty. In this document, the results for each question are listed separately, sorted by college and district office. All of the responses, including the narrative comments are included in the Appendixes to this report.

#### *Timeline Questions*

#### **Q4. Was the timeline for completion of the program review clearly communicated?**

The majority of respondents (66%) said the timeline was clearly communicated as indicated by a “yes” answer. However, when disaggregated by college and district office, there were significant differences in the responses. Both the District Office and College of Alameda had very high positive responses (over 90%). The other three colleges had much lower positive response rates as indicated below.

District Office = 92%.

Berkeley City College = 62%

College of Alameda = 90%.

Laney College = 62%

Merritt College = 59%

Comments from the three colleges with lower positive response rates also indicated that “the deadline was too early” or “short turn around with a new template and no direction” or “yes it was, but it was completely unrealistic as we never knew this was coming” or “there were folks that did not complete it by the deadline with no penalty.”

#### **Q5. Did the timeline for completing program review include a step for revision and feedback?**

Overall, the response to this question was mixed with only 55% responding positively. Many individuals said “I don’t know” or “don’t recall” or “not sure” or “it wasn’t clear.” The positive response rates by college are:

District Office = 67%

Berkeley City College = 59%

College of Alameda = 80%

Laney College = 50%

Merritt College = 48%

### *Data Questions*

#### **Q6. Was the necessary data available in a timely manner?**

Overall, the majority of respondents (55%) reported that the data was available in a timely manner. However, when the results are disaggregated there are significant differences with Berkeley City College at the lowest positive response rate. There were also multiple negative comments, such as “we had to do our own statistics” or “yes, but it was hard to navigate through the data” or “it required an absurd amount of hunting” or “some data was available, some wasn’t” or “some information was incomplete.” The positive response rates are:

District Office = 73%

Berkeley City College = 21%

College of Alameda = 60%

Laney College = 55%

Merritt College = 52%

#### **Q7. Was the data easy to summarize or analyze?**

The majority of respondents did not answer positively to this question (42%). The disaggregated data shows that Berkeley City College and College of Alameda had the most difficulty utilizing the data. The positive response rates are:

District Office = 55%

Berkeley City College = 29%

College of Alameda = 40%

Laney College = 52%

Merritt College = 48%

**Q8. Did your data analysis include a review of survey results that indicated student satisfaction or the efficacy of your department or unit?**

The majority response (54%) was no. However, this average is skewed by the positive responses from the District Office, since the District Service Centers did distribute a satisfaction survey of their operations District –wide as part of their program reviews. College responses were much lower and college comments included “no, but that would be a good idea” or “yes, but the data sample was small” or “minor amount of data available”. The positive response rates by location are:

District Office = 64%

Berkeley City College = 45%

College of Alameda = 20%

Laney College = 31%

Merritt College = 33%

***Training Questions***

**Q9. Did you participate in any training sessions regarding program review?**

Although everyone was using a new template with distinct handbooks for specific areas, there was not wide-spread participation in training in the use of the new handbooks district-wide. It is not clear if training was available at all locations. Positive response rates by location are:

District Office = 55%

Berkeley City College = 41%

College of Alameda = 30%

Laney College = 52%

Merritt College = 45%

**Q10. Was the training helpful?**

The individuals that did participate in program review training activities were satisfied in the training as evidenced by the positive response rates by location below.

District Office = 83%

Berkeley City College = 73%

College of Alameda = 67%

Laney College = 60%

Merritt College = 54%

*Program Review Prompts/Questions*

**Q11. Which question or section was the most challenging and why?**

The complete set of narrative responses are included in the Appendix to this document. Listed below are some examples of some of the most frequent responses.

District Office =

1. “analysis from past years”

Berkeley City College =

1. Data related items – “all the data was not available”, or “it took weeks to collect the data”, or “analyzing data for each course”, or “any section requiring data, the district could not provide it”, or “data was missing on student placement”, etc.
2. Redundant and/or repetitive questions.

College of Alameda =

1. Data – “having to go through rosters to calculate success and retention”, or “interpreting the data”, sections requiring data input and analysis.”

Laney College =

1. Data related items – “the questions about enrollment, productivity, student success, completion and retention were challenging,” or “just interpreting all that data if you are not a data/numbers person is hard,” or “staffing and faculty ratios were hard,” or “assessment section and DE section asked questions wehre there has never been data gathered.”
2. Overall process – “nothing addressed the lack of clarity concerning the finished product, “finding the time – it took me over 32” hours to write the program review.”

Merritt College =

1. Timeline – “The timing of the data delivery and the deadline were too close,” or “we had one week t complete the work and then it was not acted upon for months” or “there was chaos here at Merritt, no clear direction or program review process or due dates, procedures, etc.”
2. Data related items – “ it would have been great to get the data early, we got it the evening before it was due” or “data comparison of my unit with other similar units” or “demographic data, specifically related to gender and ethnicity.”

**Q12. On which question or section would you like to have additional training or clarification and why?**

District Office =

1. “all of it, please get someone who is current on this stuff”

Berkeley City College =

1. Data related items -- “data needs to be given to the departments in a timely manner:, “numbers could have been organized and prepared better”.
2. “Aligning our goals with institutional goals”

College of Alameda =

1. Data related items – “data fields should be filled in and summarized”, “I would like to be given the opportunity to have a one-on-one appointment with a researcher who can present the data, review it with me and answer any questions that I have, “ “having the appropriate data specialists at the DO do the data grunt work in advance.”

Laney College =

1. Data – “If no one is going to populate the data for us, then someone needs to train us on where to find it, how to populate it into the report and how to interpret it, “ or “We need more data on equity, “ or “we – and I mean everyone – are looking at data in a narrow way and it is dangerous!”.

Merritt College =

1. Timeline – “we need a more flexible timeline for completion and review of completed program reviews.
2. Training – “we (Student Services/Counseling) did not receive ANY training so we would have like training on the entire program review document” or “training on how to collect data for comparison” or the whole program review requires training and clarification” or “At Merritt there is no direction.”

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The results of this survey indicate variations in the experiences of individuals that participated in the 2015 Program Review process. However, there are consistencies across the District, in regard to two primary areas: utilization of data and the overall program review process timeline.

First and foremost are the issues identified that are related to the use of data in completing the 2015 program review process: The timeliness of the distribution of program review data was an issue for all locations. Also, the format of the data was problematic for many. There were also many comments indicating that the data that was distributed was incomplete. Finally, training in interpretation of the data was either lacking or inadequate.

The second area of concern was the overall timeline for completion of the program reviews. Many felt that the deadline was too early, the overall time to complete the program reviews was not long enough, and/or the communication regarding due dates was not clear. This was especially evident at Merritt College.

**Appendix**  
**Program Review User Survey**  
**Survey Monkey Results**

<http://web.peralta.edu/programreview/program-review-task-force/program-review-user-survey/>